THE GUIDE IN CONTROVERSIES, Or, A Rational Account

Of the Doctrine of

ROMAN-CATHOLICKS,

Concerning the *Eccleſiaſtical Guide* in *Controverſies* of *Religion.*

Reflecting on the later Writings of Proteſtants; particularly, of Archbiſhop *Lawd*, and Mr. *Stillingfleet*, on this Subject.

By *R. H.* Abraham Woodhead

1. Pet. 3. 15. —*Parati ſemper ad ſatisfactionem omni poſcenti vos rationem.*

2. Cor. 6. 8. —*Per Infamiam & bonam Famam; ut Seductores, & Veraces.*

Printed in the Year, MDCLXVII.

The Preface to the Reader.

AFter the ſad effects of diſcord, and quarrels in *Religion* ſo long experienced, an End of ſuch *Controverſies* cannot but be by all pious Chriſtians moſt paſſionately deſired: And an end of them, if it may be, by an *Infallible*, or unerring deciſion, of thoſe *neceſſary*. That a *Writing* alſo, if clear and free from any ambiguity in its ſence, may decide theſe is confeſſed by all; (For if words written cannot, neither can words ſpoken, ſince nothing can be ſaid, but what may be recorded): and granted alſo, that ſuch Writing doth decide them infallibly, if it be the *Holy Scripture*. But it appears, that the *ſence* of *Holy Scripture* is not, in all *Controverſies* that are thought *neceſſary* to be determined, ſo clear, but that it is called in queſtion, and diſputed, by conſiderable Parties. For the ending of which, therefore, that God hath left another *living Guide* (his *Church*, or the *Eccleſiaſtical Governors* thereof), which is, in all Ages, in the expoſition of *Holy Scripture*, and the deciſion of theſe *Controverſies*, as to *Neceſſaries*, *Infallible*; from other Sects eaſily *diſcerned*; in its ſentence eaſily *Underſtood*, is, in theſe *Diſcourſes*, pretended to be proved: And learned Proteſtants alſo ſhewed, to maintain thoſe Principles, from which it ſeems rationally conſequent.

Any ſuch *living*, *Infallible*, Guide *Proteſtants* ſtrongly deny, and oppoſe. And, hereby, if indeed there be ſuch a *Guide*, 1ſt. incurr great peril, as to their Salvation, By denying a due obedience, and Submiſſion of Judgment to its *Authority* and *Definitions*; And, by deſerting its Communion, as not to be enjoyed on

other termes. And 2ly. become *unsettled*, and of a *various* judgment, in several points of Religion of great concernment, and daily subdividing into more *Sects*.

Their many objections, therefore, and difficulties, urged against the Being of any such Guid, are here considered, and replyed to: Especially those occurring in the writings of their later Divines, Arch Bp. *Lawd*, Bp. *Bramhall*, Dr. *Hammond*, Dr *Ferne*, Mr. *Chillingworth*, Mr. *Stillingfleet*, and others. Whose Art and diligence hath been so great in fighting against their own Happiness (if I may so say), and in hindring Themselves and others, with all imaginable arguments, from returning into the Unity of the Catholick Church, and Faith, that there seemes nothing left out, or neglected by them, that can hereafter be said, new, in their Defence. Of which objections, whether any of moment, and pertinent to the matter in hand, are, here, concealed, or of those mentioned any not fully satisfied, is left to the equal Reader's Judgment.

The Author, though conscious of his weaknes, yet confident of the Cause, and presuming so necessary a Truth to have so much advantage over Error, as that it needeth not the very sharpest wit, and exactest Judgment, to vindicate and maintain it, hath taken in hand this task, (in the long silence of many other more able Workmen), that he might give satisfaction to some persons, who seem, with great indifferency, to desire it; and that the Adversary, in having the *last Word*, might not also, to some weaker judgments, seem to have the *best Cause*. And, to this end, He hath also wholly applyed himself, herein, to the *language* and *expressions* of *Protestants*, used in this Controversie; and indeavored to follow their Motion to the smalest Particulars, and last Retraits; and hath built a good part of his discourse on their own Concessions (as more prevalent with such Readers), and those materials, which their own writings afford, advantagious to Truth, and the present design.

Recommending this most important affair to the Protestant Readers most serious consideration. As which, if what is promised here be made good, will possess Him of a much more true, and solid Satisfaction, and Tranquility of minde, than his former Principles could possibly afford Him: ** Whilst now he discernes himself, (contrary to what he, before, imagined), guarded, in his way to heaven, with a *double Guide* unfailable: *The Holy Scriptures*, in what points they are *clear*: And next, the *Holy Church*, in what they seem *obscure*; into whose judgment, and sentence, he safely resolves all his former Scruples and anxieties concerning

such

such Texts, wherein a mistake is any way dangerous. *Whilst now, by a new, and holier way, of mortifying his own judgment instead of confuting another's, and especially, that of *Superiors*; and, of subduing his *passions* † instead of enriching his *intellect*; and seeking the possession of Truth by *humility*, and *obedience*, instead of *Science*, and *Argument*, he becomes fixed, and setled in most of those Controversies (as already stated by this Guide), which still entangle, and perplex others; The *light* of his own *Reason* first serving him so far, as to the discovery of that *Guide*, (a discovery, wherein, the divine providence hath left so clear and evident, that a sincere, and unbiased quest cannot miscarry) to whom once found out, he is, afterward, for all other things, (I mean, that are prescribed by this Guide), to subject and resigne, it. * Whilst now he renders himself one of those *Babes*, to whom God, by these *Spiritual Fathers*, in all simplicity believed by him, reveales what things are hid from the *self-wise*, and prudent; who are still standing upon their Guard, with *Pythagoras* his μέμνησο ἀπέχειν, and the Jewe's *Quomodo*, (*Jo.* 6. 52.), in their mouths; missing of Truth, (where *Authority*, and *Tradition*, teach it), out of too much wariness to be deceived. * Whilst now, as *Mary* at our *Lord's*, so he meekly sits at his *Church*'s feet, and heareth her words; when as those others, whom he hath left, full of learned cares from their youth, (like St. *Austine*, when a *Manichee*), how, and where to finde *Truth*, taught to believe no side; to search, and rifle all; are stating, all their life long, every Controversie a new to themselves; one on this manner, another on that; examining all, pretended, *Foundations*, whether solidly laid, (For where, say they, may not an *Humane Testimony* deceive them?) even from the more *principal*: The essential *Unity* of the *Trinity*; The *Divinity*, and *Eternity* of *Christ*, and of the *Holy Ghost*; the *Ubiquity* of *Gods essence*, and his *Absolute Præscience*; the *number*, and right use of the *Sacraments*; The *Commission* of the Churches *Hierarchy*, and *Bishops*; their just authority, and from whom they hold it; (for, in all these, they finde acute *Divines* calling on their impartiall, and unresigned, judgment for a review); to those *lower* points (yet these also of no small debate among persons straied once from this *Guide*) of the lawfullness of *bowing* at the *Communion Table*; of being uncovered in *Churches*; of making the signe of the *Cross* in *Baptism*; of Baptising one yet an *Infant*; of wearing a *Surplice*, &c. Things (high, or low) that trouble none, who hath once undergone the mortification of dethroning his own judgment aud captivated it to the unity of the *Churches* Faith.

† St. *Augustin. De Serm. Dom. in Monte*, l. 1. c. 3. On *Beati pauperes spiritu* — *Oportet, animam se mitem præbere pietate, ne id, quod imperitis videtur absurdum, vituperare audeat; & pervicacibus concertationibus, efficiatur indocilis.*

2.* Whilst now also, after such an humble obedience, and conformity first yielded, he passeth further; and comes to understand the *doctrines* of this *Guide* to be much other, than they were formerly represented unto him; and to be assented-to, on good *reason*, as well as submitted-to, on just *Authority*; saying with those *new Converts* in St. *Austin* † — *Nos falsis rumoribus terrebamur intrare; quos falsos este nesciremus, nisi intraremus — Gratias Deo, qui expertos docuit, quam vana, & inania de Ecclesiâ suâ mendax fama jactaverit:* For the Churches Doctrines are seldom, by her adversaries, delivered favourably; and either the *Sense* of her *Divines*, not given with their *words*; or those Writers quoted, who affect extreames, and do afford more advantage to the Gain-sayer; and the most of men, whilst aliens from the Church, and obliged, by their secular interest, to dislike, and oppose her Tenents, taking no great care to inform themselves, what these are, save only from those, who disguise and misrelate them.

† Ep. 48.

3. But now, thus undeceived, in the last place he receives yet more contentment to see, that *Church*, spread over all *Nations*, and once the *Spouse* of *Christ*, not, since, to be (as he formerly fancied) for many Generations, miserably apostatized from her primitive faith, and purity, and stained with a manifold *Idolatry*, (whilst the Great *Antichrist* sitteth in her cheif *Chair*, and giveth her lawes); poisoning the Nations with her gross errors, and daily making more of them to drink of the *wine* of her *Abominations*, and herself also drunk with the *blood* of the *Saints* (for such things his *Teachers* once made him believe); But this Church to be a *Foundation abiding sure*, and the *Pillar of Truth*, for ever; Our *Lord* walking still amongst her *Candlesticks*, and holding her *Stars* in his hand; and by them from age to age enlightening the dark places of the world; *Internal*, and *External* Sanctity, *Corporal*, and *Spiritual* mortifications, accompanying one another, and growing together to an Angel-like purity in her *Saints*, and those, who order their actions according to her most excellent Doctrines, and Councils of Perfection. In the lives of which *Persons* (found in all later ages a most exact pattern of the former) he now examines the *Holiness* of this *Church*, and not in those others (whose crimes in every age are by the Church's Adversaries curiously sought out, and divulged, to shew, that most scandalous persons have professed the Roman Faith, (as, who was ever so wicked, as one of our *Lord's Disciples*) Whom he now discernes to have departed no further from *Goodness*, than they also did from her *Rules* and *Lessons*; and well perceives, that a continued purity of the Church's doctrine is, more rationally, collected from the Sanctity of the one, than

2 *Tim.* 2. 19.
1 *Tim.* 3. 15.
Apocal. 2. 1.

than a Corruption therein, from the viciousnes of the other; because it may rather be presumed, that the wicked should transgres the Churches lawes, than the virtuous transcend them; and because, both of *Persons*, and *Ages*, some may be observed to have been much more impious, than others (as perhaps the 9th, or 10th age, than the 11th, or 12th); where, yet, the Churches *Doctrines* or *Lawes* are confessed to have suffered no mutation; and therefore such wickedness not to have proceeded from their influence; and where those holy men of the same times, who are produced to reprehend the faulty, yet are known to have continued still with them in the same *Communion*, and *Faith*.

*Whilst now, he also discernes an uniform descent of the Church's faith, and a true concatenation between the doctrines of the former *Fathers*, and latter *Schoolmen*. and the *sentences* of the one constituting the *Theology* of the other; these later ascending indeed (by pursuing the necessary consequents of former Principles), into the highest subtleties of this divine Science; but without pretending a *Reformation* of any thing formerly delivered, or imposing their *new* discoveries on any ones *Faith*. And therefore no more now, doth he look into them, only as a *Spy* into the Camp of the Enemy, to discover the specious fallacies of these great Wits against truth, and to give intelligence to his own party to beware of their Sophisms; Or, at best, turnes ore their Volumes only to pick here, and there, a flower, as it were out of a Garden overrun with weeds: But, now, reads them, as a dutiful *Son*, or docible *Schollar* doth the lessons of his *Master*, or prescriptions of his *Ancestors*, to transcribe, and follow their Institutions, and rules, and propagate to posterity what he learnes from them. Neither, on another hand, takes he now any more disgust and scandal at her *Moral Divines*, and *Casuists*; considering them according to their proper imployment; not as persons conversing with *Saints*, and drawing up Rules of *perfection*; but applying themselves to the Confessions of *Sinners*, and with as equal a ballance, as Theology affords them, weighing the culpableness of such actions, as are brought before them, in order to exciting a due and proportionable Penitence and Contrition. Where he easily sees, that it were an equal injustice in them, to aggravate, as to lessen, faults: and to put mens Souls into false scruples, and terrors, as to leave them in false securities. Hence are they mostwhat busied in setting forth the utmost bounds, which an action, not, to be *perfect*, or praiseworthy, but *lawful* or sinless, is capable of: or also not this: but only, what bounds it must not pass to be not sinning *mortally*: or

not

not *mortally* in such a particular species thereof: though perhaps in some other it is so. * Which *Casuists* he now discerns to be greatly wronged, when some sentences of theirs, commonly stript also of some of the necessary circumstances, are produced, as recommending, or encouraging an action, that is only by them declared, no sin; or as countenancing or excusing a sin, that is only declared by them no such crime, as excludes from Grace, and the state of of Regeneration; or as calling Evil, good; when as that Circumstance is concealed by the Accuser, upon which supposed only, and not absolutely, they pronounce such action Good, or lawful.

Again, * Whilst now, being thus established in a right understanding of the *Church*, and of her Doctors, He proceeds to look upon those Heterodox persons, who from time to time have *gone out* of this *Church*, not as departing out of *Babylon*, but out of the *City of God*; and that have all, till *Luthers* last defect on, after a short blaze, come to nothing. And again, looks on those *Nations*, who from time to time (even from the furthest East and West) have *entred into* this *Church*, not as, thus, reduced only from one *Idolatry* to another (which he formerly imagined) from the *Heathen* Idolatry, to the *Roman*; but, from *Gentilism* to that *Faith*, to which our Lord foretold, and promised, a *conversion* of all *Nations*, before the last times; and that, not the Kingdome of *Antichrist*, but of *Heaven*, hath been truly preached unto them; the same *Kingdome* to other Heathen People by her indefatigable missioners now, which was, heretofore, to our Ancestors by St. *Austin*, that holy Monk. All these illuminations and consolations will he receive, and all these Divine Providences will he rejoyce in, and praise God for, in this *Church*, if it shall once be discovered to him to be his *true Guide*; and if that which is asserted in these Discourses, shall (by the Grace and Benediction of *God*) appear to him *Truth*.

Matth. 24. 14

In the proof and evidencing of which, the Author likewise hath reason to expect from him the more favourable audience, because those, who most vehemently dispute against any such *infallible Director*, yet cease not to wish, that there were such a one; as a thing acknowledged most highly beneficiall to Christianity; and they maintain the Controversie, not without a professing, that they would most willingly be confuted in it, — *If there be such an infallible Judge of Contraversies* (saith Mr. *Chillingworth* †) *it would have been infinitely beneficial to the Church, and perhaps as much as all the rest of the Bible, if in some Book of Scripture, which was to be undoubtedly received, this one proposition had been set down in terms &c.* [Now, if it be not necessary, that there should be such an infalli-

† c. 2. §. 136.

ble

ble Judge,; what great neceſſity, certainly to know him, in caſe there were one? yet, this a thing, he ſaith, *infinitly beneficial to the Church, and perhaps as much, as all the reſt of the Bible.*] And, elſewhere, — *If I knew* (ſaith he) *any one Church to be infallible, I would quickly be of that Church.* Behold this, by *Proteſtants* ſo earneſtly wiſhed for, *R. Catholicks* ſhew unto them, with proofs ſufficient to ſatisfie the rational, but not force the obſtinate: It faring no better with this *Church*, than with its *Lord*: Of whom many of the *Phariſees*, and ſelf-wiſe, though deſiring nothing ſo much as the happineſs, once to ſee their *Meſſias*, or live in his daies, yet, (even whilſt they converſed familiarly with him, and received all Salutary doctrine from him, confirmed with Miracles) being blinded with many other prejudices, and miſtaken fancies concerning Him, and alſo wanting that humility of the Common people, to Learn this Truth, amongſt others, from Him, that He was their *Meſſias*, could never perſwade themſelves, that He was indeed ſuch a Perſon, and ſo periſhed in their unbelief.

But Bleſſed be our *Lord*, who mean while both, then, clearly manifeſted Himſelf to thoſe, who were *Babes, i. e.* humble, and not *wiſe* in *themſelves*: And, ſince, upon his neceſſary departure, hath not left his Children here, *Orphanes*, and deſtitute, either of Spiritual *Fathers*, of whom he hath ſaid; that *He that heareth them, heareth Him*: [therefore theſe not miſguiding in neceſſaries]: or of a Spiritual *Mother*, of whom he hath ſaid: that *He that Heareth Her not, ſhall be eſteemed as an Heathen*: Nor yet left his *Little ones* deſtitute of ſufficient Evidences, and markes, by which, for ever to diſcern true *Parents*, and *Guides*, from other *Pretenders*, and *Impoſtors*; ſo that they *know* their *Voice*; and *do not follow the voice of ſtrangers*. Which *Evidences* the Author preſents to the ſerious Inquirer in theſe following Diſcourſes, and commits him to the powerful *Teacher of hearts*, and the illuminations of his *Holy Spirit*.

Matt. 11. 25. *Rom.* 12. 16. *Luk.* 10. 16. *Jo.* 10. 4, 5.

Errata.

Disc. 1.

Page 1. lin. 12 read. belong
6. l. 15. r. 3. And.
10. l. 32 *dele* If.
11. l. 14. r. are.
20. l. 27. r. render.
25. l. 1. r. Bishops
26. *marg.* r. 398.
29. l. 22. r. 176.
30. l. 14. r. which Councils.
marg r. 10. and 14.
33. l. 21. r. Contrasts
36. l. r. them].
38. 21. r. Consequently
39. l. 33. r. Melchites.
l. 42. r. is necessary
42. l. 10. r. 1*st*. These
44. 19. r. 37.
45. l 7. r. men [professing
50. 23. r. and Transubstantiation, in five
l. 41. r. *Nice*].
56. 3. r. religion (for so none would be Schismaticks, but Arch Hereticks.
73. *ult.* r command.

Disc. 2.

79. 4. r. these.
80. 33. r. sufficient for deciding Controversies
83. 8 r. there is (considering the times)
87. l. 15. r. colour. See 4 *Disc.* §. 11. 12.
96. 22. r. rendring
103. 15. r. Sabellianism
104 27. r wherein
Ib. Dele (
28. r. (But
105. 29. r. *Valens*
33 r. Essence
122. *marg.* r. 104. 171
— *Stillingf.* p. 242.
123. 19. r. *Quonam*,

Disc. 3.

143. 33. *marg.* r. *Chillingw.* p. 140. 118. 166
145. 8. r. that part.
17. r. subordinate
150 9. r. oppose or deny the truth of
153. 14. r. follows
156. 3. r. clearing
157. 7. r. limitation.
169. 14. r. Corporal presence in the Eucharist.
170. 11. r. to be generally condemned.
186. 10. r. to
194. 27. r. thereof under one.
199. *marg.* r. Churches
203. 30. r. *Monachi.*
204. 10. r. *probate*
205. 22. r. confession)
26. r. *veterum*
213. 9. r. Testimony
21. r. *plures, an paucos* ?
22. dele. *paucos*.
223. 1. r. is so evident
17. r. hoped ?]
224. 3. r. reflections.
10. r. *quos*
15. r. Faith only.
32. r. the contrary doctrines
234. 6. r. *Anathema*
247. 26. *subjacete.*
254. 40. r. the last
259. 19. r. upon
267. 21. *dele* authority
269. 8. r. *fide.*
271. 23. r. *fidei.*
275. 38. *marg.* r. † p. 137
286. 38. r. on.
301. 36. r. *honoratis*
305 *Chrisma*
307. 3. r. *regimine*
311. *marg.* *Æthiopum*
321. 3. r. Church,

Disc. 4

332. 23. r. *Carpocrates*
338. 13. r. ὁμοούσιος.
342. 39. *dele*, as.
365. 30. r. fides.
Preface. p. 4. l. 1. r. 2.

THE FIRST DISCOURSE.

Relating and considering the *varying* Judgements of learned Protestants, concerning the *Ecclesiastical Guide.*

The CONTENTS.

THE *Church Catholick granted by all, in some sence, unerrable in Fundamentals, for ever.* §. 1. Chap. 1.

I. *Some Protestant Divines granting the Church Catholick unerrable in Fundamentals, or Necessaries, but not as a Guide.*—§. 3.
Reply.— §. 6.

That the divine promises of indefectibility, or not erring in Necessaries, belong to the Church Catholick, as a Guide; or to the Guides of the Church Catholick— §. 6.

Several limitations of Protestants concerning these promises. Chap. 2.

1. *That they were made only to the Apostles.*— §. 8.
Reply. §. 9.

2. *Or made to all the succeeding Church-Guides, but conditional.* §. 12.
Reply.
That our Lords promise of Indeficiency in Necessaries, made to the Clergy, is absolute.— §. 14.
And this Indeficiency, most rationally, placed in the General Councils; or other accord, or consent of the Clergy equivalent to such Council.— §. 15.

Some Protestant objections.— §. 17. Chap. 3.
Answered. §. 18.

II. *Other Protestant Divines granting the Clergy (some, or other of them) alwayes unerring in Necessaries: but this not necessarily, the superior, or Major, part of them.*— §. 25. Chap. 4.
Reply.
That the subordinate Clergy can be no Guide to Christians,

when opposing the superiour: nor a few, opposing a much Major part. — §. 30.

Chap. 5. III. *Other Expressions of Protestant Divines, granting the Churches Prelatick Clergy, as defining her doctrines, or the General Councils of them, to be unerrable in necessaries; when these Councils accepted by the Church universal.* — §. 32.

Expressions to this purpose,

**Of Dr.* Potter. — §. 33.

**Of Bp.* Bramhal §. 34.

Where

Concerning what judgment of the Church sufficiently obligeth; In respect,

1. *Of the Church Catholick diffusive.* §. 36 n. 1.
2. *Of Councils General.* §. Ib. n. 8.

Where

Of the Freedome of the Council of Trent. §. Ib. n. 9.

**Of Bp.* Lawd. §. 37.

Where

Concerning what acceptation of Councils, by the Church Diffusive, is onely necessary. — §. 38.

**Of Dr,* Field. §. 40.

Chap. 6. IV. *Learned Protestants conceding, the former Churches Clergy, preceding the Reformation, never so to have erred in defining Necessaries, as that the Church Governed by them, did not remain still True, Holy, and Catholick.* — §. 41.

Chap. 7. V: *That, according to this last Concession (§. 41.) there seemes to be * a great security to those continuing still in the antient Communion.* — §. 48

As to avoiding Heresie, or Schism. Ibid.

As, to other gross Errors. — §. 51.

*And * danger to those deserting it.* — §. 54.

Where

The Protestants Defence for it — §. 55. n. 1.

And the Catholick Remonstrance. — Ib. n. 2.

Chap. 8. VI. *That, according to the former Concession* §. 32. *(if so enlarged, as ancient Church-practise, and reason requires), all or most of the Protestant Controversies are, by former obliging Councils, already decided,* — §. 56. n. 1. &c.

An Instance hereof in the Controversie of the Corporal presence *of our* Lord *in the* Eucharist, *or* Transubstantiation. — §. 57.

THE SECOND DISCOURSE.

Proceeding (upon the Conceſſions of Learned Proteſtants; That the Paſtors of the Church, ſome or other, in all Ages, do infallibly guide their Subjects in Neceſſaries) to ſearch, which, in any Diviſion of theſe Paſtors, are thoſe, to whom Chriſtians ought to adhere, and yield their Obedience.

The CONTENTS.

Proteſtants grant, Chap. 1.

1. *That there is, at this preſent, an One, Holy, Catholick, and Apoſtolick, Church.* §. 1.
2. *That the preſent Paſtors, and Governours thereof have authority to decide Controverſies.* §: 2.
3. *That theſe Governors (ſome, or other of them) ſhall never err, or miſs-guide Chriſtians, at leaſt in abſolute Neceſſaries to ſalvation.* §. 3.
4. *That they, and the Churches governed by them, ſtand alwayes diſtinct from Heretical, or Schiſmatical, Congregations.* §. 5.

Catholicks further affirm, Chap. 2.

5. *That if theſe Paſtors guide unerringly in Neceſſaries, the people are to learn from them, what, or how many, points are neceſſary, ſo far as the knowledge thereof is neceſſary to them.* §. 6.
6. *Again; That the Neceſſaries, wherein theſe Eccleſiaſtical Governors are infallible Guides, ought not to be confined to ſome few points abſolutely neceſſary, but extended to all ſuch points of Faith, as are very beneficial to Salvation.* §. 9.
7. *Concerning the exact diſtinguiſhing of neceſſaries from non-neceſſaries.*
   1. *That there ſeemes no neceſsity, that the Church guides ſhould be enabled exactly to diſtinguiſh them.* §. 12.
   2. *That they may infallibly guide in them, though not infallibly diſtinguiſh them.* §. 14.
   3. *That they guiding infallibly in all neceſſaries (and no diſtinction of theſe made) ought to be believed in all points they propoſe (except an infallible certainty can be ſhewed to the contrary.)* §. 15.

an

4. That these Governors do distinguish, and do propose as such, all those more necessary points, which it is requisite for Christians, with a more particular explicite Faith, to believe. §. 17.

8 That Christians, submitting their judgment to the present Church-Governors in deciding all necessary matters of Faith, ought also to submit it to them, in declaring the sence of the Fathers, or of the Definitions of Councils, and former Church, concerning the same Matters. §. 19.

9. That, supposing these Guides to err in some of their Decisions, yet their Subjects, (by the concession of Learned Protestants) ought to yeild the Obedience either of silence, or also of assent, to them in all such points, whereof they cannot demonstratively prove the contrary. §. 20.

10. From whence it follows, that none may adhere to any new Guides; but only so many, as can demonstrate the Errors of the former. §. 21.

Chap. 3.

11. Granted by all; that these Church Governors may teach diversly; and some of them (more, or fewer) may become erroneous in Necessaries; and misguide Christians in them. §. 22.

12. In such dissenting, therefore, That there must be some Rule, for Christians, which Guides they ought to follow: and that this is, and rationally can be, no other, than, in these Judges' subordinate dissenting, to adhere to the Superior, in those of the same Order, and Dignity dissenting, to the major part. §. 23.

Where,

Of the Major part concluding the Whole, in the ancient Councils. § 25. n. 2. And,

Of the Magnitude of the Defection of the Church-Prelacy in the time of Arrianism. § 26. n. 2.

13. That, accordingly, both in Councils their defining Matters of Religion, and in the Church's acceptation of their Decrees, the much Major part must conclude the Whole, and the opposing of their Definitions also be Heresie; and separation from their Communion, Schism; if an Opposition, or separation from the Whole, be so. § 27. n. 4.

14. As for the Protestant Marks, whereby, in any Division, to know these true Guides; [viz. A right teaching of God's Word, and a right Administration of the Sacraments;] that these are things to be learned from these true Guides first, known. § 28.

An

An Application of the former Propositions in a search, which of the oppo- Chap. 4.
site present Churches (or of the dissenting Ecclesiastical Governors thereof) is our true Guide. § 30.
Motives perswading, that the Roman, and the other Western Churches united with it, and with the Head thereof, St. Peter's Successor, are this true Guide.
1. Their being the very same Body with that, which, Protestants grant, was 150 years ago the Christian's true Guide: and the other Body, confessing themselves, in external Communion, departed from it. § 33.
2. Their being that Body, to which (if we follow the former Rule recited, Prop. 12.) we ought to submit. § 35.
3. Their being that Body, that owns, and adheres to, the Definitions, and Decrees of all the former Councils, such as the Church of preceding Ages, hath received as General, or obliging; as well those Councils since, as those before the Sixth, or Seventh Century: which later, the other Party rejects, § 37.

The pretended Security of those Protestants who deny any certain, li- Chap. 5.
ving, or Personal Guide, infallible in Necessaries; affirming,
1. That, all necessary Matters of Faith are even to the unlearned, clear in the Scriptures; and the Controversies, in non-necessaries, needless to be decided. § 38.
2. That all Necessaries are clear in Scripture; because God hath left no other certain, Means, Rule, or Guide, for the knowledge of them, save the Scriptures; § 39. n. 1.
Not any certain living Guide.
1. Which is infallible; as their Guide, the Scriptures are. § 39. n. 2.
2. Which the unlearned, in any Division, can discern from the false Guides; or know their Decrees better, than the Scriptures.
3. From whom, the Scriptures direct them, to learn Necessaries; or tell them, what Church, or Party they are to adhere to, in any Schism made; In which infallible Guide, if there were any such, as being a thing of the greatest concernment, the Scriptures would not have been silent. Ibid.
Reply.
1. That, Evidence of the Scriptures hath been the usual Plea of former Heretics, in their dissenting from the Church. § 40. n. 1.
2. That, as to the main and principal Articles of the Christi-

an

an Faith, the ſufficiency of the Rule of Scripture is not denied by Roman *Catholicks; but only the clearneſs thereof, as to all mens capacities, queſtioned, And another Guid held neceſſary.* §. 40. n. 2.

It is replyed then.

I. Concerning the clearneſs of Scripture.

1, *That ſome Controverſies in Religion, ſince the writing of the Scriptures, have been concerning points neceſſary; As thoſe Controverſies concerning the Trinity; the Deity, and Humanity of our Lord, the neceſity of God's Grace,* &c. §. 41.

2. *That, the more clear all neceſſaries are in Scripture, ſtill with the more ſecurity may Chriſtians rely for them on the Church's judgment; from which alſo they receive theſe Scriptures,* §. 42.

3. *That, there is no neceſsity that all Neceſſaries ſhould be revealed in Scriptures, as to all men, clearly.*

1. *Becauſe it is ſufficient, if God hath left this one Point clear in Scriptures, that we ſhould, in all difficulties, and Obſcurities of them, follow the Directions, and adhere to the Expoſitions, and Doctrins, of theſe Guides.* §. 43.

2. *Sufficient; if God hath, by other Apoſtolical Tradition at leaſt, clearly revealed, to theſe Church-Guides, all ſuch neceſſary Truths, to be (ſucceſsively) communicated by them to his people,* §. 44.

3. *Sufficient, if God hath, by Tradition at leaſt, clearly revealed to theſe Church-Guides the ſence of ſuch Scriptures as are, in points neceſſary, any way obſcure,* Ibid.

4. *Sufficient, if God, in the Scripture, hath clearly enough revealed all neceſſary Truths to the capacity of theſe Church-Guides, uſing due means, though he hath not to the capacity of the unlearned; for from thoſe, theſe may learn them* §. 45.

II. Concerning a living Guide.

1. *That, where the Scripture, (eſpecially, ſeveral Texts compared) is ambiguous, and in Controverſie, the Chriſtians Guide, to know the true ſence, cannot be the Scripture, but either the Church's, or their own, judgment.* § 46. n. 1.

2. *That it is not neceſſary, that God, in the Scriptures, ſhould direct Chriſtians to what Guide they are to repair.* § 46. n. 2.

Or to what Church Prelates, or Party, in any Schiſm, Chriſtians for ever ought to adhere. § 47. n. 2.

3. *Yet, that God hath given Chriſtians a ſufficient direction herein, in his leaving a due ſubordination among theſe Governours, whereby the Inferiors are ſubjected to the Superior, and a part*

unt

unto the whole. § 47. n. 3.

And, that Christians may more clearly know the sence of their Definitions in matters controverted, than the sence of the Scriptures. § 48.

THE THIRD DISCOURSE.

Examining, What measure of obedience is due to these Guides, and to the Supreme Ecclesiastical Judge of Controversies.

The CONTENTS.

Chap. 1. ROman Catholicks and Protestants do agree.

1. *That the Scriptures (speaking of those books, by the Protestants stiled* Canonical *) are the Word of God.* §. 1.
2. *That in these Scriptures, agreed on, it is clearly declared; that the Church Catholick of no age shall err in Necessaries.* §. 2.
3. *That the Church Catholick is contradistinct to Heretical and Schismatical Churches.* §. 4.
4. *That Christ hath left in his Church Pastors, and Teachers, to keep it from being tossed to, and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine.* §. 5.

Chap. 2. Catholicks go on, and affirm

5. *That the Church Guides; at least assembled in Lawful General Councils, shall never err in their determining things of necessary Faith.* §. 6.
6. *Shall never err in necessaries; not taken for those that are absolutely required, but for all that are very beneficial, to Salvation.* §. 9.
7. *Shall never err in them, not as infalliblly inspired to teach any new, but as divinely assisted, in delivering of the former, revelations, and Traditions; wherein, they affirm, that the Church of all ages since the Apostles is for ever preserved* equally *infallible.* §. 10.
8. *That, for knowing, what, or how many of former Councils have been lawfully General, and obliging, a Christian may safely rely on the General judgment of the Church, since the sitting of such Councils.* §. 11.
9. *That, in the absence of a considerable part of the Church-Governors from some Councils, yet their acceptance of its decrees, or concurrence with its doctrines, renders it equivalent to a Council General.* §. 13.

10. That

10. *That particular, persons, or Churches, parts of the whole, are obliged to submit their judgment, and yield their assent to the Definitions of the whole.* §. 14.

11. *That whatever particular person, or Church, holds the contrary to any* known *definition (passed in a matter of Faith) of any lawful General Council, is Heretical.* §. 16. Chap. 3

12. *That any particular person, or* Church, *which, for any cause whatever, doth actually relinquish, and separate from the external communion of the present* Church Catholick, *is Schismatical.* § 20.

13. *But yet; That several persons, or Churches coordinate, may without Schism, differ in any thing, opinion, or practise, wherein they are not obliged to accord, by their Common Superiors, or by the whole.* §. 23.

But Protestants, after the four first propositions conceded in some sence, do thus indeavour to qualify, and restrain them. Chap. 4.

5. *In granting the* Catholick Church, *in all ages, unerrable in necessaries*, they understand *only such few Necessaries, without the explicit belief of which Salvation cannot be attained.* §. 24.

6. Therefore also they affirm; *that though the* Church Catholick *cannot err in such points absolutely necessary to Salvation, yet it (or all particular Churches, in som one age, or ages,) may in others, the errors wherein are dangerous to salvation, groß, damnable,* &c. §. 25.

Because it appears, that many of the chief points, from which Protestants dissent. were General Tenents and practices, at the comming of Luther. §. 36.

7. *They affirm, That though the Church Catholick cannot, yet General Councils, such as are not universally accepted by the Church diffusive, may err in absolute necessaries to Salvation; and that the Councils also universally accepted may err in non-fundamentals, or non-necessaries.* §. 34.

8. *Yet, that they allow all such Councils as are generally accepted by the Church diffusive, to be either lawfully General, or equivalent thereto; and also to be infallible in necessaries.* § 35.

Where,

That necessaries *in their sence, restrained only to a very few points of the Faith, and* universal acceptation, *extended to all sects of Christians, do free them from any obligation to all, or most, Councils formerly held in the Church.* § 36.

9. *And, that they grant an obedience due to the Definitions and Decrees of such Councels from all inferior, persons, or Churches.* § 38.

10. *But, this obedience, not necessarily that of* assent *to their decrees, (unless such decrees be in, and known to be in, necessaries) but only of* silence, *and* non-*publick* contradiction. § 39.

Where,

Concerning the quality of the obedience, that is yeilded by the Church of England *to the decrees of the first General Councils.* § 40.

11. *Nor this* silence, *or* non-contradiction *generally due to all the decrees of such Councils; but only to such decrees, wherein the error of the Council is not* manifest, *or* intolerable. § 43.

Nor this breach of silence, *or* contradiction *of such decrees, allowed only so far, as to make complaint to Superiors: who not allowing their complaint, they are to acquiesce; but allowed so far, as that they may proceed, upon the Superiors by them-conceived neglect of a redress, to a reformation.* § 44.

12. *And the Judgment, when such errors are,* manifest, *and* intolerable, *and to be reformed, left to every particular, person, or Church, for themselves.* § 47.

Chap. 5.

13. *Accordingly, they declare, and confine, Heresie to be an error obstinately maintained (not against some Church-Definition, but) some fundamental Article, of the Faith; without allowing any certain Judge, what, or how many Articles are fundamental; and so, what is Heresie.* § 51.

14. *Concerning Schism: 1st, In respect of* inferiors; *they declare it to be, not any separation whatever, but a separation causeless* (§ 55.) *or also (as some more straiten it) a separation in essentials* (§ 57.) *from the Communion of other Churches, or of the Church Catholick: here again, without leaving us, any certain Judge, what points are essentials; or, when the separation causeless; and consequently, when Schism: (unless perhaps the separatist be this Judge).*

2. *Again: In respect of* Superiors *they enlarge* Schism; *and declare them also guilty of it, so often, as, by requiring unjust conditions of their Communion from Inferiors, they give the cause of separation: whereby the chief, and governing, Body of the Clergy of the whole Catholick Church, at* Luthers *appearance, seems by them charged with Schism; and that from the Catholick Church.* § 61.

Whether the Ecclesiastical Superiors, when departing from no other their Superiors, can become, in respect of their subjects, guilty of Schism. § 63. n. 1.

The Contents.

A Reflection on the former different Theſes of theſe two parties, concerning Church-authority, *and the obedience due thereto.* § 64. Chap. 6.

And,

A Review of the two preſent oppoſite Churches; which of them moſt reſembles the ancient Catholick Church. § 67.

The face * *of the ancient Catholick Church.* Ib.

* *Of the preſent Roman Church.* § 72.

* *Of the preſent Proteſtant Churches.* § 76.

An Enquiry,

Whether the Church *of* England *doth not require obedience of* Aſſent, *or* Belief, *to her* Articles *of* Religion. Chap. 7.

Several Canons *in her Synods ſeeming to require it.* § 83. *n.* 1

The complaint of the Presbyterians, conc. it. § 83. *n.* 4.

The Doctrin of her Divines, conc. it. § 84. *n.* 1.

Where,

Conc. the juſt importance of Negative Articles. § 84. *n.* 1. *and* 85. *n.* 2. *And*

Conc. conditional aſſent. § 84. *n.* 4. *and* 85. *n.* 10.

That to ſome of the 39 *Articles aſſent is due, and ought to be required by the Church of* England *from her ſubjects.* § 85. *n.* 1.

That the Roman Church doth not require aſſent to all the Canons of her Councils, as to points Fundamental; i. e. *of any of which a Chriſtian neſcient, cannot be ſaved.* § 85. *n.* 4.

That the requiring of obedience, either of Aſſent *or* Non-contradiction, *by the Church of* England *to all the* 39 *Articles, ſeems contrary to the laws of the Church, and to the Proteſtant Principles.* § 85. *n.* 11.

Solutions of ſeveral Proteſtant Queſtions, concerning the Supreme Eccleſiaſtical Guide, or Judge of Controverſies. § 86. Chap. 8.

1. Q. *From what we can be aſſured, That Councils are infallible, ſince neither the Texts of Scripture, the ſence whereof is diſputed; nor the decree of any Council, whoſe erring is the thing queſtioned, can give ſuch aſſurance?* Ib.

2. Q. *Whence General Councils have their infallibility: ſuch promiſe, if made, being made only to the Church diffuſive; and not delegable by this Church to others; or if ſo; no ſuch delegation from the univerſal Church appearing, before hand, to have been made to all or any General Council?* § 91.

3. Q. *How the infallibility of General Councils, is neceſſary, or ſerviceable to the Church? without which Councils the Church ſubſiſted,*

for several ages, most Orthodox. § 98.

4. Q. *How lawful General Councils, which experience hath shewed to have contradicted one another, can be all infallible?* § 100.

5. Q. *Lawfull General Councils being supposed to be liable to error in some things: How Christians can be assured, concerning any particular point, that these Councils do not err?* § 101.

6. Q. *Whilst such Councils are supposed infallible, How, if they should not be so, can any error of theirs be rectified?* § 102.

7. Q. *Whether such Councils, only when confirmed by the Pope, or also, unconfirmed by him, be infallible?* § 104.

8. Q. *How the Popes confirmation can any way concur to such Council's non-erring, since if It erred, it doth so still, though he approve it; if orthodox, it is so still, he not approving it.* § 105.

9. Q. *In which, the Pope or the Council, this infallibility lies; if in one of them, the other needless. If in both, then either of them sufficient: such qualities being (where they are) indivisible, and without integral parts?* § 106.

Chap. 9.

10. Q. *If general Councils infallible; whether they are so in their conclusions only, which will infer Enthusiasm, or new Revelation, or also in their premises, and proofs? upon which, assent will be due also to all their arguments.* § 107.

11. Q. *Why, being infallible in their Conclusions, or Definitions, They do not end all Controversies, but leave so many unresolved?* § 108.

12. Q. *How such infallibility of theirs differs from that of the Apostles; and that, of their decrees, from that of Scripture?* § 109.

13. Q. *How, many persons, or guides, all fallible, can make one infallible?* § 112.

14. Q. *Supposing all lawful General Councils infallible, yet how can any know infallibly which are lawful General Councils? because of the many conditions required to make them such: in some one of which he can never be infallibly certain, that any one of them hath not failed.* § 114.

Chap. 10.

15. Q. *Lastly, Catholicks pretending, a Divine Faith of the Articles of Christian Religion to be necessary to Salvation; and all Divine Faith, necessarily to be grounded on Divine Revelation; It is asked, upon what ground, a Christian, by a Divine Faith, believes all those Articles of his Faith, that are defined by particular Councils? Where if said; from the Testimony of the present Church, which is in the former manner, (i. e. by divine Revelation,) infallible; The question returns, whence this Testimony can be proved to be in such a manner infallible, without making a Circle: in proving, this present Church to be*

be so infallible from Gods Word (written, or unwritten :) and then again, proving infallibly such to have been Gods Word from the infallible testimony of the present Church? Nor can the testimony of the Church be proved to be infallible, in such a manner as to ground divine Faith upon it, from the Motives *of* credibility, *or from any thing else, but only from a divine Revelation,* i. e. *from Gods Word; because divine Faith can never resolve it self into any ground, that is not divine Revelation,* § 120.

To which is answered.

1. *That the object of a divine Faith is alwayes in it self infallible,* § 123.
2. *That divine Faith alwayes ultimatly resolvethit self into divine Revelation, and that into some one wherein it ultimately resteth, without a processe in* infinitum, *or turning in a Circle.* § 124. n. 1. — 132. — 143, — 144.
3. *That divine Faith is alwayes wrought in Christians, by the operation of Gods Spirit.* § 124. n. 2.
4. *That from the operation of this H. Spirit may be produced in Christians a sufficient certainty of divine Faith, whatever uncertainty be in the extrinsecal proponent thereof.* § 125.
5. *That Church-Tradition, in delivering unto us the divine Revelation, is only the Introductive, not the object, of a divine Faith.* § 126.
6. *That there is no absolute need, either of it, or any other extrinsecal infallible Introductive, or proponent, for a Christian's attaining a divine Faith.* § 127.
7. *Yet that there are those morally-certain grounds produceable for this Faith, and all the Articles thereof, as they are believed in the Catholick Church, which no other Religion besides the Christian; nor, in Christianity, no other Sect, or seducing private Spirit, can pretend to.* § 135.

That a rational certainty, or morally-infallible ground, of a Christians Faith thus far at least, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, *and consequently whatever is contained therein, infallible, is affirmed by all.* § 136.

8. *But further : that an infallibility in the Guides of the Church (as perpetually assisted by the H. Ghost for all necessaries, wherein the true sence of Scriptures, or verity of Tradition Apostolical, is questioned, and disputed) is believed by Catholicks. From which infallibility of these Church-Guides, clearly revealed to them in Scripture, and by Tradition Apostolical, they retain a firm Faith of all those points, which are not in Scripture, or Tradition, as to all men, so clearly revealed*

led: Whilst others, denying the infallibility of these Church-Guides, and only allowing that of Scripture, miscarry in their Faith concerning some of the other points; or can have no firm ground of their believing them. § 140.

Shewed from the Precedents, That no Circle is made in the Roman Catholick's resolving either of a divine and infused, or acquisit, and humane, Faith. § 143. &c.

Chap. II. *A Supplement to the* 4th Chap. 26th §. *Wherein is shewed a Consent of the Doctrine and practice of the* modern Eastern *Churches with the* Occidental, *in the chief points of present* Controversie.

[1. *Transubstantiation.* §. 158. n. 2. — 177.
2. *Adoration of the Eucharist.* §. 159. — 177.
3. *Sacrifice of the Mass.* §. 160. n. 1. — 177.
4. *Invocation of Saints.* §. 161.
5. *Prayer for the Souls of the Faithful departed, as betterable, thereby, in their present Condition.* §. 162.
6. *Communion in one kinde; or, of the Symbol of our Lords Body onely intinct.* §. 163. 178.
7. *A Relative Veneration of Images, or Pictures.* §. Ibid.
8. *Monastick Vows: And Marriage denied the Clergy after the taking of Holy orders.* §. 164. and, §. 179. n. 1.
9. *Auricular, or Sacramental, Confession.* §. 165. 179. n. 2.]

The Replies *made hereto by* Protestants, *considered.* §. 182. &c.

The

THE FOURTH DISCOURSE.

Containing the *Socinians* Apology for the be believing and teaching his Doctrine againſt former Church-Definitions, and preſent Church-Authority, upon the Proteſtant-Grounds.

Divided into Five Conferences.

The firſt Conf.

OF *his not holding any thing contrary to the Holy Scripture* §. 2.

The ſecond Conf.

Of his not holding any thing contrary to the unanimous ſence of the Catholick Church, ſo far as this can juſtly oblige §. 13

The third Conf.

Nor, contrary to the Definitions of lawful General Councils, the juſt conditions thereof obſerved. §. 18.

The fourth Conf.

Of his not being guilty of Hereſie. §. 23.

The fifth Conf.

Nor, of Schiſm. §. 28.

THE FIRST DISCOURSE: Relating and Considering the Varying Judgments of Learned Protestants concerning the ECCLESIASTICAL GUIDE.

CHAP. I.

The Church Catholick granted by all, in some sence; unerrable in Fundamentals, for ever. §. 1. *Of Protestant Divines,* I. *Some granting the Church Catholick unerrable in Fundamentals, or Necessaries; but, not as a Guide,* §. 3. R. *That the Divine Promises of Indefectibility, or not erring in Necessaries, belong to the Church Catholick, as a Guide; or, to the Guides of the Church Catholick* §. 6.

§. 1. The Church Catholick, granted by all, in some sence, unerrable for ever in Fundamentals.

FIrst, that the *Church Catholick* of any Age whatever is unerrable in *Fundamentals*, or *absolute Necessaries to Salvation*, both by *Roman-Catholicks* and *Protestants* is granted; for otherwise, in some Age, there would be no Church Catholick; Errour in such Fundamentals destroying the very Being of a Church.

But when, from the *Church Catholick*, it is by *Catholicks* ascended §. 2.

cended to the *Governours* or *Guides* thereof. (to whom this *Church* is committed by our Lord, departed hence); That they are also, by our Lords promise, and assistance, unerrable in their Decrees; *They*, at least in a *lawful General Council* of them (such as the times, wherein such Councils are assembled, do permit); *unerrable*, at least so far, as to *Necessaries*; Here the *Protestants* make a stop; and seem to differ, one from another, in their Judgments.

§. 3.

1. Some Protestant-Divines granting the Church Catholick unerrable in Fundamentals, or Necessaries, but not as a Guide.

Mr. *Ch llingworth*, in his Answer to *F. Knot*; and after him Dr. *Hammond*, in his Answer to the Exceptions made against the Lo d *Falklands* Discourse of Infallibility, with their followers in this point, (among whom I number the two late *Repliers*||) affirm indeed, the Church Catholick (according to the former Proposition) to be always unerrable in Fundamentals, or Necessaries But then; by *Church Catholick* they mean such a Church, as neither is, nor can be any Guide to us; carefully distinguishing between the *Church Catholick*, and her *General Councils*; and holding, that, even in Fundamentals, all her Councils whatever (except such, as are, in their way, universally accepted ‖) may err, though she cannot.

|| See Mr. *Stillingf.* p. 154, 251, 252. 514, 517. 55. — *Whitby* c. 9 and 20.

To this purpose, See Mr. *Chillingw.* (cap. 3. §, 39.) discoursing on this manner, —— *I must tell you, you are too bold in taking that which no man grants you; that the Church Catholick is an infallible Director in Fundamentals. For if she were so, then must we not only learn Fundamentals of her, but also learn of her what is Fundamental, and take all for Fundamental, which she delivers to be such. In the performance whereof, if I knew any one Church to be infallible, I would quickly be of that Church. But good Sir, you must needs do us this favour, to be so acute, as to distinguish between, being infallible in Fundamentals, and being an infallible Guide in Fundamentals. That she shall be always a Church infallible in Fundamentals we easily grant; for it comes to no more but this: that there shall be always a Church. But that there shall be always such a Church, which is an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, this we deny, For this cannot be without setling a known infallibility in some one known Society of Christians, (as the* Greek, *or the* Roman, *or some other Church) by adhering to which Guide, men might be guided to believe aright in all Fundamentals.* Muchwhat the same he saith cap. 2. §. 139. —— *You must know, there is a wide difference between, being infallible in fundamentals, and being an infallible Guide even in fundamentals.* Dr. Potter *saith, That the Church is the former: That is, there shall be some men in the world*

§. 4.

whilst the world lasts, which err not in fundamentals: for otherwise there would be no Church. But we utterly deny the Church to be the later: for to say so, were to oblige our selves to find some certain Society of men, of whom we may be certain that they neither do, nor can err in Fundamentals, nor in declaring what is Fundamental, what is not Fundamental: and consequently to make any Church an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, would be to make it infallible in all things, which she proposeth, and requires to be believed. And cap. 5. §. 60. —— *You suppose untruly, that there is any that visible Church, I mean any visible Church of one Denomination, which cannot err in Points Fundamental.*

§. 5.

[VVhere you may observe: that Mr. *Chilling worth* 'taketh the *Church-Catholick*, that is infallible, only for some 'certain persons, in some place, or other, professing Christi-'anity, who, whilst the world lasts, *de facto* do not err in Fun-'damentals; and that, as he affirms, no *Church of one Denomi-'nation* to be infallible in *Fundamentals*; so he holds, neither 'any *Council*, nor any visible Body of Ecclesiastical Magistrates 'whatsoever, or how far soever extended, that proposeth to 'Christians matters of Religion, to be infallible in Funda-'mentals; as you may see quite through the third *chap.* of his 'Book; and as is manifest also from his reasons against the one, 'which are of like force against the other. Therefore though 'he frequently names *Church of one Denomination*, and not *Coun-'cils*, yet you shall find that to [*this Church of one Denomination 'errable*] he opposeth not [*Councils un-erring*] but only [*some 'men in the world, whiles the world lasts*, de facto *not erring*]: 'and to these, it is, and not to Councils, or any Ecclesiastical Go-'vernors, that he applieth our Saviours promise. Yet, what 'hinders, but that the Church-Catholick, in some times, as it 'stands contradistinct to Heretical, and Schismatical Churches, 'may be in his sense a Church of one Denomination? nay, any 'Church, that is so united, as to give Laws, and to have all its 'members involved in one external Communion, though it be 'an aggregate of many particular Churches, and those in seve-'ral Nations, truly is so: and the *Church-Catholick* always is but '*One*, as we confess it in our *Creed*: But one *Body* it is, and 'therefore not uncapable of one *name*, or denomination; and 'hence, all the *Western Churches*, in the times of *Luther*, having 'only one external Communion, may be said to be a Church of 'one Denomination, and so were for a long time both the

'*Eastern*, and *Western*. This Caution I thought meet to give 'you, that his seeming limitation [*of one Denomination*] may 'not deceive you.]

§. 6. After him, thus also Dr. *Hammond*, in defence of the Lord *Falkland*'s Discourse against the Exceptions ‖; —— *I shall* (saith he) *thus far consent with you. First*; *That the universal Church is in Fundamentals infallible*, —— *But then*; *this Infallibility must signifie no more, or is to be no farther extended, than that Christ doth, and will so defend his Church, that there shall be for ever, till the end of the world, a Church Christian on the earth*; i. e. *that the whole Church shall not, at once, make an universal defection, err from the foundation, or do any thing, by which there shall cease to be a Church on the earth.* *But then* 2ly. *I say, that this very universal Church, though it be in this sence infallible in Fundamentals, is not yet a Rule, or Canon, or Guide, or Judge infallible, even in Fundamentals*; *visible it is, infallible it is, but it is not a visible Judge, or Rule infallible.* Thus Dr. *Hammond*. Here you see, these Authors make a distinction between the *Church Catholick*, and the Body of her *Governors*, or her *General Council* giving Laws: and in allowing Infallibility in Necessaries to the Church Catholick; remove it from the General Council, because they think it not safe to allow the Church Catholick unerrable, as a *Guide*.

‖ c. 1. §. 5, 6. p. 23.

§. 7. *Reply.* But this their denying, the Church Catholick to be unerrable as she is a Guide, seems utterly contrary both to our *Saviour*'s *Promises*, made to *her* in the Scriptures; and also to the *Concessions* of other Modern Learned *Protestants*. (which see below §. 25 *&c.* 32, *&c.*

Where. That the divine Promises of Indefectibility, or, not erring in necessaries, belong to the Church Catholick as a Guide, or to the Guides of the Church Catholick.

First, As concerning our Saviour's *Promises* (from which is collected the Church's *Indefectibility*) all, or most of them are expresly made to the *Guides* of the *Church*; and therefore to the *Church*, as a *Guide*; that so these might be set for ever, to all Nations, as a *City on a Hill*; and as a *Candle on a Candlestick* ‖. * See (*Mat.* 28. 19, 20.) Upon our Saviour's sending his Successors abroad to *teach the Nations*, his promising to *be with them*. [*i. e.* with the Teachers of these Nations] *to the end of the World.* * See (*John* 14. 16, 26. —— 16. 15. Compared with *Acts* 15. 28. —— 1 *Joh.* 5. 20, 27. —— 1 *Cor.* 12. 7, 8.) his promising them a παράκλητος, [*i. e.* an Assistant] *that should abide with them for ever*; *to teach them all things*; *and to bring all things*

‖ Mat. 5. 14, 15.

things to their remembrance. *For ever:* *i. e.* Not with *the Apostles* only: For then what would become of the Nations, that, after their times, were still to be instructed? (especially, when any Controversies should arise concerning the understanding of the Apostles Writings: which Writings are miss-understandable in things necessary; and which S. *Peter* saith, in his time, *the unlearned wrested to their own destruction* ‖); but with *their Successors* also. * See (*Mat.* 18. 20. compared with 17, 18.) his promising, that *when they were gathered together in his name* [to hear the Causes brought to the Church: brought to her still daily, notwithstanding the Scriptures,] *he himself would be in the midst of them*; and would ratifie in heaven, what they should, upon earth; which implieth also, that he would assist them on earth, (at least when this is a supreme, and unappealable, Church-authority), to do, as to the main, both what was meet to be submitted to by those, whom he sent to their Tribunal; and what was meet to be ratified by the heavenly Tribunal. But if, after the *Rule* of Scripture, the necessity of such *Tribunals* ceased, why are these afterward continued, and, in Controversies of Faith, appealed, repaired to? * See (*Mat.* 16. 18, 19.) his promising *that the Gates of Hell should never prevail* against those, *to whom he gave the Keys* [*i. e.* against the Clergy]; nor against *the Church* built by, and upon, them. And * see (*Luk.* 23. 31.) the not failing of S. *Peter's* Faith prayed for, by our Lord, in order to *establishing his Brethren.* * See (1 *Tim.* 3. 15.) *the Church* (unlimited to the Apostles days) said to be the *Pillar, and ground of Truth*; surely this from its *Teachers* being so, For so the Apostle elsewhere, using the same *Metaphor*, frequently calls these Teachers (*Gal.* 2. 9.) *Pillars*; (*Eph.* 2. 20.) *Foundations*, and *Grounds*: amongst which Teachers *Timothy* being admitted, is warned here to be very circumspect, and careful of his behaviour: And * see (2 *Tim.* 2. 19. compared with 16, 17, 20.) *the Foundation of God, the Church standing sure*: notwithstanding that *Hymeneus*, and some others (as Vessels in this great house of God, not of Gold, and Honour, but of Earth, add Dishonour) *had erred from the Truth of God.* * See (*Eph.* 4. 11, 13.) his giving these Teachers, *that the world should not be tossed to, and fro with every wind of Doctrine.* In whose Doctrine therefore, in order to this end, this Doner hath fixed some stability; neither can it be applied only to the Apostles, or their times; seeing that the experience of so many various winds of Doctrines, even since all their VVritings, and

‖ 2 Pet. 3. 16.

concerning

concerning the ſence of their VVritings (ſee 2 *Pet.* 3. 16.) Blowing in the Church, and carrying the unſtable to and fro, argues the ſame neceſſity of ſuch *Doctors* ſtill. And * ſee *Rev.* 1. 13, 16. Where our Saviour (to denote his perpetual preſence to theſe ſucceeding Teachers, and Governors of his Church) after all the times of all the Apoſtles, ſave St. *John*, is deſcribed, though in Glory, yet walking in the midſt of the ſeven Mother-Churches of *Aſia*, and holding their Biſhops in his hands. And therefore he hath commanded an Obedience to theſe Governors proportionable to his aſſiſtance; that thoſe, *who will not hear them*, ſhould be reckoned as *Heathens, or Publicans*, he being *in the midſt* of their Aſſemblies; and ratifying *in heaven*, what their Sentence *binds, or looſeth on Earth.* (*See *Mat.* 18. 17, 18, 20.) ——And hath ſaid concerning them ‖; *that he that heareth them, heareth him*: From which may be gathered; that that Clergy, who have ſtill the ſame miſsion from him, may require the ſame audience, in his ſtead.

‖ Luke 10. 16.

CHAP. II.

Several Limitations of Proteſtants, concerning theſe Promiſes. 1. *That they were made only to the Apoſtles*, §. 8. 2. *Or made to all the ſucceeding Church-Guides, but conditional*, §. 12. R. *That our Lord's Promiſe of Indeficiency in Neceſſaries was not made to the Apoſtles only, but to their Succeſſors*, §. 9. *And to their Succeſſors, not conditional, but abſolute*, §. 14. *And that this Indeficiency in Neceſſaries is moſt rationally placed, by the Church, in her General Councils; or ſuch accord and conſent of the Clergy, as is equivalent to ſuch Councils*, §. 15.

§. 8.

‖ *Chillingw.* p. 92, 115, 19. —*Stillingf.* p. 256, 258, 259, 519.

Several Limitations of Proteſtants concerning theſe Promiſes.

1. That they were made only to the Apoſtles.

IN Anſwer to theſe Texts: ſome of the Reformed ‖ would reſtrain theſe *abſolute* Promiſes only to the Apoſtles, or firſt Promulgators of the Goſpel, for this reaſon: becauſe no need, that they ſhould be extended to any more. For by theſe firſt, for all ſucceeding times, was a *Written Rule* left; clear, and plain, even to the *unlearned*, and to all that uſe *common reaſon*, in all *neceſſary* points of Faith; and therefore, that all Controverſies, which theſe plain, and clear Scriptures, intelligible to every one, decide not, are not Controverſies in any point *neceſſary*; and

and need not to be decided; nor do Christians, now having an *infallible*, and *plain Rule* for Necessaries, need afterwards, besides this, another *living*, *unerrable Guide* in them.

§. 9. *Reply.* 1.

But such an Answer, 1st. Seems neither any way sufficient to satisfie the *Texts* (as hath been partly shewed already, in the Explication of them), which do promise to the world's end not a *Rule* only, but *Persons*, sent to preserve us from every wind of Doctrine; and which command *Obedience*, not to a *Rule* only, but to *Persons* expounding it, under pain of being ejected, *as Heathens*, and *Publicans*; and under pain of being *bound* in *Heaven*, when they *bind* us upon *Earth*; (an authority exercised, not only by the Apostles; but, upon the strength of these, and the like Texts extended beyond the former Limitation, by their Successors also;) Only, this Order is required to be observed in our *Obedience*; that we perform it in the first place to the *supreme* Church-authority; and, then also, to particular persons, or Churches, only as they are conformable to, and united with the *whole*; who otherwise (as experience shews) may err even in Fundamentals; and so our obedience to them ruine us.

§. 10.

Nor 2ly, seems such answer sufficient to satisfie the Necessities of the times following the Apostles; wherein, whether there have not risen controversies, notwithstanding the clearness of the *rule* left us, some of which have bin in matters necessary, and wherein the people greatly needed the directions of their spiritual Guides, I leave to your Judgment, if you please to reflect on either the old *Arrian*, *Nestorian*, *Pelagian*: or the new *Socinian*, *Solifidian*, Church-Anarchical, (both *anti-episcopal*, and also *anti-presbyteral*), errors; all maintain'd by such, who have presumed, as much as any, that they have *common reason* to understand *plain* Scriptures; Nay; who account these so clear on their own side, as to decline a trial by any other way, save by the Scriptures only. Add to this, that several such strange, and damnable Opinions arose, after this Rule written, even in the Apostolical times: From which Errors, and Heresies, from time to time, by the intervening definitions, and diligent search of the Rule, and traditive Exposition thereof, made in those supremest Ecclesiastical Courts that the times afforded, the Church hath bin hitherto preserved.

§. 11.

Mean-while, what satisfaction, or comfort can a Christian, in these present distractions of the Church, receive from such persons: who, when asked whom we shall have to end our con-

‖ Chillingw. p. 115. and 192. —Whitby p. 104. 98.

controverſies? 1st. tell us ‖—* *That theſe, if clear Scripture, intelligible to every one, decide them not, are not controverſies in any thing neceſſary, and ſo needleſſe to be ended*; [and therefore one would think it not much material alſo, on what ſide they are held]. Again; —— † *That the Plea for an infallible Guide, to ſecure us from wandring out of the Way to Heaven, is invalidated by the plainneſſe and eaſineſſe of the way; Which we cannot miſſe, unleſſe we will.* And we now ſecure; then 2ly, changing their former note, tell us: That ſome of the preſent Controverſies are ſuch, (For example the Controverſie of *Tranſubſtantiation, St. Invocation*, and *Images*;) as that, unleſs we believe them on that ſide as the Proteſtants ſtate them, we become, if we practice according to our belief, guilty of moſt groſs idolatry: (and, if it be idolatry, ſurely then it deſtroys the very eſſentials, or being of a Church) ‖ And then again (that, we in ſuch a danger, may not think of retiring to, and relying upon, our Guides), in the third place tells us; that, in the not ſeeing this *Rule* of Scripture to be clear, and manifeſt in theſe Controverſies, on the Proteſtant ſide; and in the not perceiving the Proteſtant Reaſons brought for it, to be Demonſtrations thereof; both thoſe great *Councils*, that have defined the contrary to them, and the *greateſt part* of Chriſtianity that now follows theſe Councils, all (Scripture being, in theſe, ſuppoſed for a *Rule*) want, or uſe not, *common Reaſon.*

§. 12.

2. Or made to all the ſucceeding Church-Guides, but conditional.

This of their firſt Anſwer; reſtraining theſe Texts, and our Lord's Promiſes of Infallibility only to the Apoſtles, and committing the ſucceeding times only to the Infallibility of the Apoſtles *Writings*. But yet, theſe not being ſecure here, whilſt ſome of the Texts (as hath been ſhewed) clearly enough, promiſe Divine aſſiſtance alſo to the Apoſtles Succeſſors; (which aſſiſtance can be none, or nothing worth, if not extended ſo far; as to preſerve them unerring in *Neceſſaries*); they yet further allow, from theſe Texts, a Promiſe of *Indefectibility in Neceſſaries* to be made to the Catholick Church of all Ages after the Apoſtles, taken in general, (as it is ſet down in the firſt Propoſition ‖); And not only to *her*, but to *her Guides* alſo, and *Clergy*; But then, they ſtate theſe Promiſes, as made to the Guides, not to be *abſolute* (as they are to the Church) but *conditional* only ‖: which condition they endeavour to ſhew alſo out of theſe Texts, where ſuch Promiſes are made. As * in

‖ §. 1.

‖ Chilling. p. 176 Stilling. p. 511. 519, 520.

that

that, John 14. 16. —And 16. 23.—*The Comforter shall abide with you for ever,*—*and lead you into all truth*: True, say they; *if you love me, and keep my Commandments*, John 14. 15. — And * in that, *Mat.* 28. 20. —*I will be with you unto the end of the world*; True; *If you teach what I have commanded you* — * In that, *Luke* 10. 16. —*He that heareth you, heareth me*; True; so often as ye speak my words, not your own. Therefore thus Mr. *Chillingworth*, where he sets down several irrational ways (as he calls them) of ending a Controversie ||, descants on these, and such like Scriptures;—*We could* (saith he) *refer the matter to any Assembly of Christians assembled in the name of Christ, seeing it is written: Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. We may refer it to any Priest, because it is written, The Priests lips shall preserve knowledge. The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses's Chair*, &c. *To any Preacher of the Gospel, to any Pastor, or Doctor: for to every one of them Christ hath promised, he will be with them always, even unto the end of the world; and of every one of them it is said; he that heareth you, heareth me*, &c. *To any Bishop, or Prelate; for it is written, Obey your Prelates; and again; He hath given Pastors, and Doctors*, &c. *lest we should be carried about with every wind of Doctrine. To any particular Church of Christians, seeing it is a particular Church which is called, The House of God, a Pillar, and Ground of Truth: and seeing of any particular Church it is written*—*He that heareth not the Church, let him be unto thee as a Heathen, and a Publican.* But these Means Mr. *Chillingworth* disallows, *because* (saith he) *they would fail us, and contradict themselves.* || p. 130. § 7, 8.

This then they say; that, as these Scripture-promises are applied to the *Catholick Church* in general of all, or any Age after the Apostles, they grant them *absolute*; But, as applied to any *particular Churches*, or their *Guides*, since it is certain, that such particular, Persons, and Churches may err even in Fundamentals, and do somtimes contradict one another, the Promises made to them, must be understood to be only *conditional*; and that, before that any yield, from these Texts, any Obedience to them, either of *assent*, or also (if in a matter of great moment) of *non-contradiction*, he must first look to it, whether they have performed the *condition* of the promised assistance (kept themselves to Christ's words: kept his Commandments, *&c.*): wherein also he cannot take theirs, but must use his own, Judgment; and thus are these promises voided, as to any *certain* benefit that the Subjects of the Church may expect by them; and as to any *certain* §. 13.

Obedience, which the Clergy can require, for them.

§. 14. *Reply.* That our Lord's promise of indeficiency in necessaries, made to the Clergy, is absolute. ‖ § 12.

To this way of expounding these Texts; whereby in making the promises to belong *conditionally* to every man of the Clergy they would make them belong, *absolutely*, to none of them, I return this Answer. 1st. That, by their representing Christ's promises only conditional in the manner above-mentioned ‖, they seem to unsettle the very Foundations of Christianity; whilst, from these Texts so expounded, we can have no certainty of the Infallibility of the Apostles themselves (to whom these things were said) unless we be first assured of their performance of the *Condition*. 2ly. Seeing that themselves collect from these Texts an *absolute* promise of an *indefectibility*, as to the knowledge, and belief of all Necessaries (which is the same, as an *Infallibility*, or actual security of never erring, in Necessaries) made to the *Church Catholick* in general; and seeing they do gather this from those Texts, where (as I have shewed) the promises are directed to the *Clergy*: Therefore, first, hence it seems most rationally conclusive; that though there be not a *disjunctive* indeficiency, so that no single Clergy-man is unerrable (which shall be granted them); yet there is at least a *conjunctive* absolute nonfailing, as to all Necessaries, in the *Clergy*, some way, or other. Especially if we consider, that the Church is a Body constituted in a regular Government, and doth, and must always consist of *Pastors*, and *People*; *Of Pastors* preaching the Word, and administring the Sacraments unto the People; and celebrating a publick Service of God in their Congregations; and, in such a constitution thereof, who can conceive a *People*, orthodox in Necessaries, governed at the same time by an apostatized *Clergy*? From *a Church*, then, granted *never failing*, or erring (and that is, *infallible*) in necessaries, I say, it follows most rationally, that there must be always *a Clergy* so too. Nor can any justifie their drawing from *the same* words (directed chiefly to the *Clergy*) a *certain*, and *absolute* indefectibility of the *Church*; and yet only a *conditional* one of the *Clergy*; as neither can they, with reason, where the same duty (as that, *Mat.* 28. 20. *The Baptizing, and Teaching of all Nations*) is charged upon the future *Clergy*, as well as on the *Apostles*, make the Promise of assistance of the discharge of such duty (the least of which assistances imaginable is, that they shall not miss-instruct these Nations in Necessaries) *absolute* to the Apostles; *conditional* to their followers; and yet *absolute* again to the following Church, taken in General.

To

To go on then. If some Clergy there shall always be, that shall not err; 2. Then from this it seems most rationally deduced again; *That a *General Council* especially, assembled of all the chief Prelates of this Clergy, (or, if such cannot be, then at least the *most* general, that the times permit); Or, *That the whole Clergy, or, where some dissent, the much greater part thereof, manifesting by any other way their concurrence in one and the same doctrine (which is equivalent to the Act of a General Council) shall not err. For it is more likely, that a particular person should err so, than a Synod; and a smaller Synod, than a more General; and so, of persons subordinate likewise, that those elected, and advanced to higher place of Judicature, are, both persons of greater knowledge and merit; and, according to the necessity of their place, *divinely*, more assisted; else why such a subordination, and appeal from lower to higher Courts; unless these be of the two the lesse liable to Errour, both from humane and divine help, where people can ascend to no further Director? Therefore was such a subordination instituted by God under the Law, *Deut.* 17. 8.--- And such a Practice, upon the first difference, repaired to by the Apostles (rather for an Example to Posterity, than for any absolute necessity thereof) *Act.* 15. And the Name of the *Holy Ghost* ‖, used in that Soveraign Court, the more to authentize their Decrees. Therefore also our Saviour (*Mat.* 18.) appoints such a Gradation; in conventing the offender, first before *two* or *three*, and then, before the *whole Church*; and here promiseth his more special Presence in an Assembly of Church-men, though it be but of a few ‖. And so, for persons under the Law, the *Urim* and *Thummim* at first, as an infallible Director, was committed to the *Highest Priest* alone, not to the rest; and after *Urim* taken away, yet an assistance still that person seems to have had, according as necessity required, more than the rest. See *Deut.* 17. 12. *and* Joh. 11. 31. where he saith, *That Caiaphas, being High Priest that year, propheſied in the Council, that Jeſus ſhould die, &c.* And so St. *Paul* (1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Eph* 4. 11, 14.) among those Governours, that Christ had appointed for guiding the people for ever in the same steady doctrine, makes a subordination, ranking *Pastors and Doctors* in the lowest place, and in the highest, *Apostles*: in whose place (we may presume, furnished with all *necessary* infallibility) succeed *Bishops*: *Bishops*, at least in their conjoint Body, and supreme Consults.

§. 15. And this Indeficiency most rationally placed by the Church in the General Councils, or other accord, or consent of the Clergy, equivalent to such Councils.

‖ Act. 15. 18.

‖ Mat 18. 19, 20

§ 16.

Here then; in *a General Council*, or in such *a joint Consent* of Clergy, as is equivalent to it, the Church most justly stateth and placeth that not failing in necessary Truth, which, it seems must be

‖ §. 14. allowed (and that absolute) in some Clergy ‖ for ever. God indeed could have infallibly assisted every particular person of the Clergy, as he did also the twelve Apostles; as also he, who then foresaw all the *modern Controversies*, could have set down as clear a decision, and much clearer, of them in the Apostles Writings, than is had in the Council of *Trent*: yet to his eternal Wisdom it seemed good otherwise, as he permitted *evil* in the World, the more powerfully to bring *good* out of it, and to try, and more highly reward those who adhere to vertue, so to permit *Errour* ‖ 1 Cor. 11. 19. and *Heresies* in the world (*Oportet esse Hæreses*, saith the Apostle ‖) to gain a nobler triumph afterward to the *Truth*, through the opposition of *Error*; and to try, and more highly reward those, who, not without some contrary verisimilities, do follow it. Meanwhile, this seems sufficient, in all Oppositions, for securing all necessary Truths, and preserving his Church indefective therein, if *the supremest Body* in the Clergy should not fail in their Determinations thereof; nor any other *Persons* or *Synods* fail therein, so long as they adhere to the doctrine of these *Supreme*; which if any of the inferiour Guides do not, the Church, upon any discovery is very vigilant to suspend, or cut them off from her Body. And here you may observe, that the *Subjects* of the *Catholick Church*, in their obedience also of their *particular Pastors*, though these be not free from Errour even in Necessaries, yet have much more security of not being misled by them, than other *Sects* by theirs; in as much as these *Pastors*, whose judgment the people depend on, and follow, do also generally hold, and maintain themselves obliged to follow, and obey the Judgment of these *Supreme Guides*, whom they firmly beleeve, assisted in all Necessaries by Christ: whilst this is such a submission, as the *Leaders* of Sectaries renounce and protest against.

CHAP. III.

Some Protestant-Objections §. 17. *Answered* §. 18.

§. 17. Some Protestant Objections.

I Know it is urged here ‖; [a] §. 18. That, Supposing such *inerrability* of the Clergy to be only in a *General Assembly*, or Council of them, no such infallibility can be said to be necessary at all to the preservation of the Church, which subsisted well without it for the first three hundred years, (having had for that space no General Councils,) and therefore it is vainly put. Or 2ly, [c.] If such

a

‖ See Mr. *Stillingf.* p. 258.

c.

such unerring Guide necessary; yet that Christians have no such Guide to repair to in the Intervals of these Councils.‖ 3ly[γ] as for these *Supreme Councils*, it is urged, that Experience hath shewed them not unerrable in deciding Controversies; since they are found, as well as *particular persons* and *Churches*, somtimes to contradict one another. See *Chillingw. p.* 131. arguing in this manner—— *If you say, that these* [particular Clergy-men, or Churches] *would fail us, and contradict themselves; so, as we pretend, have yours. There have been Popes against Popes; Councils against Councils: Councils confirmed by Popes against Councils confirmed by Popes; Lastly, the Church,* (i.e. Catholick) *of some Ages, against the Church of other Ages.* 4. Lastly, If such Councils granted unerring:‖[δ] yet that no *certain* knowledg can be attained by private Christians, which *Councils* is *general* and lawful, which otherwise:[ε] what be their *definitions*, and how many: and what the true *sense* of their definitions: (which, and many more like Objections see more fully solved. *Disc.* 3. §. 86. *&c.*

‖ Dr. *Pierce* his Answ. to *Cressy p.* 6. *&c.*

γ

δ.

‖ *Chillingw. p.* 93. *Stillingf p.* 528, *&c. Whitby p.* 432

ε.

To the first of these,[α,] I answer; That this *Inerrability in Necessaries* accompanies the Clergy, and preserves the Church in all times; and did so in the three first Centuries; being annexed to the *Whole Body*, or much major part of this Clergy, not only when met in a General Council, (which supposition the Objection proceeds upon,) but out of it also, whenever, and however, they shall manifest a concurrence in their Judgment, and Agreement in their doctrine; whether it be, by several *Provincial* Councils assembled; or perhaps only by some one convened in the place more infected with some new and dangerous errour, which Council afterward hath the *ratification* of the *chief Pastor* of the Church, together with his Council, and hath the tacit *approbation*, or non-contradiction of other *co-ordinate Churches*. Or whether by their *Communicatory* and *Synodical* Letters. Or whether in their publick *Liturgies* and *Offices*; Or in a General Consent in their publick Writings, *Catechismes* and *Explications* of Christian-Doctrine. In none of which, as to *Doctrine Necessarie*, the *whole* Body of the Clergy, or that which, in any dissent, is to be accepted for the whole, shall ever err.

§. 18. Answered. R. to α.

To the second [ζ.] I answer, That this Body of the Clergy, remaining in all times, if, in the Interval of Councils, any *new Errour*, dangerous to the faith, and *not formerly condemned* by any such Council, doth afflict the Church, is vigilant, by some of those wayes aforenamed, (wherein it is unerrable) as the times afford convenience, to suppress it. So was *Pelagianism* crushed, without a General Council, by several Provincial ones, and the joint

§. 19. To β.

Declarations of the Chief Prelates of the Catholick Church. But if such *Errour* trouble the Church, as hath been *condemned* by such former Councils, here the same Governours, within their several Circuits, take care to put in execution the former *unerring* Decrees. In both therefore the present Church-Guides are secure from Errour in any Necessaries; whilst, in respect of Errours fore-condemned, they adhere to, and follow, the definitions of former Councils: in new ones raised, which are thought any way to hazard the Christian faith, they unite afresh their common Judgment in some of the foresaid wayes, as times permit; either in one General, or several inferiour, Synods, or other Intelligence, or Correspondences of Churches, such, as may be equivalent to those Assemblies, which are more Oecumenical.

§. 20. To γ.

To the third [γ.] It is denied; That experience hath at any time shewed, the latter Church, or Council, to have varied from, or contradicted, the precedent. As for those points which are frequently alledged by Protestants to prove some such difference; they are either Decrees of some Council, that is declared by the Church Catholick unlawful; or Tenents held indeed by a considerable part of the Church in several ages diversly, but in none defined by her, in the manner above-mentioned.

§. 21. To δ.

To the fourth [δ.] I answer; That, what, or how many of former Councils are lawful and obligatory, a Christian ought to rely upon, and is sufficiently secure in, the judgment of the Catholick Church, taken in the sense explained before, §18. and below, §36, 38,

§. 22. To ε. 1. 2.

To [ε.] *A Christians certain knowing all the Decrees of Councils and their sense*, 1. That, though all the definitions of such lawful Councils are supposed in some kind necessary to some, or other, yet some are necessary to be *explicitly* known to one, that are not *so* to another: and that there lies no obligation on every one, or on most, to know them all; but only, when sufficiently proposed to him, not to dissent from them. 2. Next, That experience shews, that in all Churches the subjects thereof do or may sufficiently learn, from the common Tradition therein, those publick Doctrines and Articles, the confession and practise of which is required from them. At least, a Christian, using a diligence suitable to his calling, may receive sufficient instruction from his particular spiritual Guides (if these are members of the Church Catholick) both concerning them, and the true sense of them, so far as these are necessary to be known. Which particular Guides also are the less liable to mistake, or to deceive him, because (as hath been said) they do (no more, than he) proceed upon their

own

own judgment; but do hold themselves obliged to submit this to the common one of the Church, (a way of security, of not erring themselves, in what they teach others, which the Guides of all other Sects disclaim.) 3. But yet, when any hath suspicion of mis-information from these, he hath other superiour Guides, (subordinate in authority one to another,) whom to consult, and is obliged only to acquiesce in the supremest, which is secure from erring in any necessaries, as is explained in the answer to the first. In which obeying of his Guides, God, who hath enjoyned it to them, will never suffer him, in necessaries, to be misled by them. This then is the Catholick course. 3.

§. 23. As for the greater security, which Protestants pretend to be in their way of directing Christians for the knowledge of necessaries ‖; because the Rule, which they refer men to for their Guidance, the *Bible*, or *holy Scriptures*, are all true, certain, infallible; but these Guides, the *Roman* Party directs men to, especially those particular Pastors, beyond whom few go, are not so; they mis-relate the matter, For, 1st, The Bible or Holy Scriptures are equally acknowledged an all-true, certain, and infallible Rule for the guidance of Christians by both parties; and the sense thereof, where evident and not controverted, (as in many points it is clear,) by both sides, as holding it infallible, equally acquiesced in. And 2ly, Where the true sense of this common Rule happens to be disputed and brought into question; and so there is need of some other guide to shew which sense is the right, here the guide, which Protestants direct men to, is not the certain and infallible Scripture, but, indeed, in the last place, every mans own *judgment* or *Reason*; and the guide, which the *Roman* doctrine directs men to, is *their Spiritual Superiours*, and in the last place, the most supream Council of them. Where also; 1st, that supreme Guide, whom the particular Guides of Catholicks hold themselves obliged to follow, is affirmed in all their Definitions concerning necessaries to be infallible; and 2ly, Since such their Definitions are only in things, in which the sense of the Scriptures is controverted, it may be presumed, that the sense of the same Definitions is to private persons much *more intelligible*, and plain, than those Scriptures that are explained by them: And 3ly, this living Guide, from time to time, as any doubt ariseth, can render it self still more intelligible; which the *Rule of Scriptures* cannot.

‖ See *Chillingw.* p. 376. 377.

§. 24. This (from §. 3.) is spoken to those Protestant-Divines, who though they make a Promise of Indefectibility (or Infallibility in Necessaries,) *absolute* to the Church-Catholick; yet affirm it to be

be, to the Churches Clergy, even taken in the Supremeſt Conſultations and meetings of it, only *conditional*; which Promiſe of abſolute Indefectibility, being thus extended to the *Church*, but withheld from the *Clergy*, though it implies ſtill an infinite benefit, and favour to ſome *particulars*, yet ſeems to afford very litle conſolation to Chriſtianity in *General*, being a promiſing no more than this; That, in all Ages to the end of the World, there ſhall be *ſome* men in it, that ſhall, (not *teach*, but only) *retain* ſo much faith, or divine truth, as thereby to be ſaved: which thing may be, where is no preaching; no Adminiſtration of the Sacraments; and indeed no external viſible Church at all: which thing may be, though all the Clergy do Apoſtatize, if at leaſt ſome few Laicks continue Orthodox.

CHAP. IV.

II. *Other Proteſtant Divines granting the Clergy, (ſome or other of them) alwayes unerring in Neceſſaries: but this not neceſſarily the Superiour, or major, part of them,* §. 25. *That the ſubordinate Clergy can be no Guide to Chriſtians, When oppoſing the Superiour, nor a few, oppoſing a much major, part,* §. 30.

§. 25. II. Other Proteſtant Divines granting the Clergy, and Church-Guides (ſome, or other of them) always unerring in Neceſſaries: but not neceſſarily, the Superiour, or major part of them.

II. OTher Reformed Divines there are, who allow not a conditional, but abſolute, Promiſe, made to the Clergy, *ſome* or *other*, in a *greater*, or in a *ſmaller* number, in all times: Nay, yet further; made alſo to ſome viſible *diſtinct* Body, and Society, or external Communion of them, together with the Congregation of faithful adhering to them; ſo that all the Clergy ſhall never, in no Age, univerſally apoſtatize; but *ſome* of them ſtill remain Orthodox, or alſo *ſome body* of them; and there ſhall always be a viſible Orthodox Church, or Churches, ſuch as hath a right publick profeſſion of Chriſtianity, and a true Miniſtry in it of the Word and Sacraments: ſo that, according to theſe Divines, the fore-mentioned Promiſes || advance ſomwhat higher. * That Promiſe, *Mat.* 28. ſignifying, That Chriſt will be with ſome or other of his Clergy, in ſome place or other, for ever, *ſo*, as that they *ſhall certainly* teach what he hath commanded them— And *that *Jo.* 14. That they ſhall *ſo* love him, & keep his Commandments, as that his *Spirit ſhall* abide with them for ever, & lead them into all Truth [Neceſſary].—And * that *Luk.* 10. That they ſhall ſo

|| §. 12.

faith-

faithfully recite the Truths, he committed to them, as that those who hear them, hear him.

§. 26. Of this Church and Clergy *so assisted*, thus Dr. *Ferne*, ‖ —— *It cannot be imagined* (saith he), *that God, who promised to be with them, and guide them, should take away his Truth from all the Guides and Pastors of his Church, and preserve it by the Judgment and Conscience of Lay-people: but that some Guides and Pastors, (though of less number and place) still be they, that shall detect prevailing Errours, and preserve the Truth.*

‖ Division of *Engl* and *Rome*.

§. 27. To the same purpose is that Testimony of Mr. *Hooker*, ‖ —*That Gods Clergy are a state, which have been, and will be, as long as there is a Church upon Earth, necessary, by the plain Word of God Himself; a State, whereunto the rest of Gods people must be subject, as touching things that appertain to their Souls health. For where Policy is, it cannot but approve some to be leaders of others, and some to be led by others.* [This Clergy then, to have thus *a perpetual Being*, must never err in *Fundamentals*; and therefore it will be irrational to deny them, in *these*, to be a perpetual, secure, and unerring Guide.]

‖ 3 l. p. 124

§. 28. To the same purpose speaks Arch-Bishop *Lawd*, ‖ —— *There must be* (saith he) some one Church or other *continually visible.*— *For if this be not so, then there may be a time, in which there shall not any where be a visible Profession of the Name of Christ, which is contrary to the whole scope and profession of the Gospel.*—*And this* (saith he) *such a visible Church, as hath in all Ages taught the unchanged Faith of Christ, in all Points fundamental* ‖. ——And thus Dr. *Field* also ‖ affirmes; *That the Church is always visible in respect of the Order of Ministery; and due obedience yielded thereunto; and them discernable, that do communicate therein*——and below——*That always an open, known, and constant Profession of saving Truth is preserved and found among Men, and the Ministery of Salvation continued and known in the World: for how* (saith he) *should there be a Church gathered without a Ministery* ‖. And in the Preface to his whole Book of the Church, he discourseth on this manner. —*Seeing the Controversies of Religion, in our times, are grown in number so many, and in matter so intricate, that few have time and leisure, fewer strength of understanding to examine them, what remaineth for men desirous of satisfaction in things of such consequence, but diligently to search out Which, amongst* all *the* Societies *of the World, is that* blessed Company of Holy ones, *that Houshold of Faith, that Spouse of Christ, and Church of the living God, which is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, that so he may embrace her Communion, follow her Directions, and rest in her Judgment.* Thus he. And

‖ §. 37. p. 318

‖ Numb. 3, 5

‖ 1 l. 10. c. p. 14 15.

‖ See 2 l. 6 c.

§. 29. And thus far went Mr. *Calvin* long ago; holding, that there is a visible Society, consisting of Clergy and Laity, which is the only *Church Catholick*; the Pillar and Ground of Truth; and the visible external Communion thereof to be continued in. See his *Instit.* 4, *l.* 1. *c.* 2. §. upon the Article [*Credo sanctam Catholicam Ecclesiam*] —— '*Ecclesia* (saith he) *ideò Catholica dicitur, seu universalis; quia non duas, aut tres invenire liceat, quin discerpatur Christus, quod fieri non potest* —— 4 §. —— *In Symbolo, ubi profitemur nos* credere Ecclesiam, *id non* solùm *ad visibilem, de quâ nunc agimus, refertur, sed ad omnes quoque electos Dei* [therefore this Article relateth to a Church visible, and visible in all Ages]— *Quia nunc de visibili Ecclesiâ disserere propositum est, discamus vel ano* Matris [that it is termed a Mother] *Elogio; quam utilis sit nobis ejus cognitio, immo necessaria: quando non alius est in vitam ingressus, nisi nos ipsa concipiat in utero, nisi pariat, &c. Adde quod extra ejus gremium nulla speranda est peccatorum remissio, &c.* [such a visible Mother-Church then it seems there is in all Ages, some where or other, as that none can enter into life, that are not numbred among her children, and inclosed within her bosom] —— 7. §. —— *Quemadmodum ergo nobis invisibilem solius Dei oculis conspicuam —— Ecclesiam credere necesse est; ita hanc, quæ respectu hominum,* Ecclesia *dicitur, observare, ejusque communionem colere jubemur* [i.e. *Communionem externam, visibilem, Ecclesiæ visibilis*] —— 10. §. —— *Cujus* authoritatem *spernere,* —— *vel* castigationes *ludere, nemini impunè licet; & multo minus —— ejus abrumpere unitatem* [*authoritatem, castigationes*; he must mean of the Clergy, and the spiritual Governours, thereof] —— *Sic enim* [Dominus] *ejus authoritatem commendat, ut dum illa violatur, suam ipsius imminutam censeat. Neque enim parvi momenti est, quod vocatur columna, & firmamentum, veritatis, & domus Dei. Quibus verbis significat Paulus, ne intercidat* Veritas Dei *in mundo, Ecclesiam* [visibilem] *esse fidam* ejus *custodem* [and that in all Ages, else *intercideret veritas*]; *quia ejus ministerio, & operâ voluit Deus puram verbi sui prædicationem conservari.* —— *Unde sequitur* discessionem *ab* Ecclesia *Dei*, & Christi abnegationem *esse.* —— 8. §. —— *Proinde, quatenus eam agnoscere nostrâ intererat, Dominus certis notis, & quasi Symbolis nobis designavit* —— 10. §. —— *Symbola Ecclesiæ dignoscendæ, verbi prædicationem* [*sinceram,*] *Sacramentorumque observationem* [*ex Christi Instituto.* See § 9.] *posuimus* —— 11. § —— *Ne sub Ecclesiæ titulo impostura nobis fiat, ad illam probationem, seu ad Lydium lapidem, exigenda est omnis Congregatio, quæ Ecclesiæ nomen obtendit* —— 2. *l.* 4. §. —— *Minimè permovere nos debet inanis hic fulgor* [Romanensium], *ut Ecclesiam*

clesiam esse recipiamus, ubi verbum Dei non apparet. —— 7. §. —— *Quis ausit eum cœtum, nullâ cum exceptione, Ecclesiam appellare, ubi verbum Domini palàm, & impunè conculcatur? &c.* —— [Thus *Calvin*, in this place, (but how constant elsewhere to this doctrine, I say not) of the authority of, and the obedience due to, a permanent visible Church, which is *Columna, & Firmamentum veritatis*, and which is Governed by Christs Orthodox Ministers of the Word and Sacraments: which Church he affirmeth to be the *Reformed*, and not the *Roman*. Concerning the Church then, *Which is It*, he, and the Roman Catholicks differ; but not in the Obedience due to the Church, if he may name it.] Lastly, were Protestants in this matter altogether silent, yet those essential Notes or Marks they give of the true Church, *The true preaching of Gods Word, and right Administration of the Sacraments*, always to be found in the Church, do infer a *Clergy*, (to whom only both these Offices do belong) as well as *a people, always Orthodox*.

§. 30.

Reply.

Where.

That the subordinate Clergy can be no Guide to Christians, when opposing the Superiour; nor a few opposing a much major part.

But here again; so long as these Divines do still, together with the former, deny the promise of such a perpetual divine assistance to Superiour persons, or Synods of the Clergy in respect of Inferiors, or to a major part of a Synod in respect of a lesser, that holdeth or teacheth contrary, (which Superiours, and major part only, in such cases, must be the Christians Guide) a thing warranted by as universal a Tradition and Practice, as any Fundamental whatever of Church-Government; and whilst they do affirm this assistance, continued only to *some* Clergy or *other* always, but how inconsiderable a party for number, or dignity, in respect of the rest, they know, nor matter not; In saying this, they in effect say no more than the former; This Clergy, which they affirm unfailing in necessaries, being, in such a case, only *private persons*, not *Guides* to others, no not to their own Flocks: who (according to the *Traditive Constitution* of Church-Government) are not to hear their own private Pastors, teaching contrary to the definitions of Superiour Prelats, or Councils, or in a Council, a lesser part voting contrary to a major; not to hear an *Arrian* Bishop teaching contrary to the Council of *Nice*; nor the Patriarch *Nestorius* and *Dioscorus*, and their Adherents, voting contrary to the Council of *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*, (of this see what is said more at large in the second Discourse §. 23. &c.) And therefore, if *the Promises* are interpreted in this their manner, the people, in following the Superiour, the major part, (the *Traditive* Rule of Obedience always observed in the Church) sometimes will be tied to obey only those of the Clergy, to whom

Christ denies such assistance, and to disobey those, who have it.

§. 31. Neither matters it much (as to constitute them a Guide any more for this) though this supposed Orthodox Clergy, in whom our Saviours *promise* is *said* to be preserved, be all too of one distinct Communion, and one particular Church, or Nation; and these too the whole Clergy of that Church. Because the whole Church, through the whole world, is but one *body* governed by *one* Law of Christ; neither hath any, against the whole, more reason to adhere to *his own* particular Church, (when separating) as to a *Guide*, because *his own*, than to any other; unless he hath some greater assurance of its non-erring, than of any others; and besides, what reason in this kind he hath to take that particular Church, wherein he lives, for his Guide, the same have all other Christians, living elsewhere, to refuse it for theirs; and to adhere to their own particular Church: and thus, if he, by such obedience, light on truth, they by the same obedience will be necessitated to Errour. Again, if (suppose) twenty six Bishops of *several Nations*, opposing an Oecumenical Council, cannot be a Guide to all Christians, much less can they, if all these of *one Church*, or *Nation*; because here is more dependence one on another; and so a just fear of less integrity. Lastly, if *these*, against the *whole*, can have any authority; the proceedings of General Councils in condemning, and exercising Ecclesiastical Censures against them, as subjects to those Courts, have bin unjust, (which yet those General Councils, universally allowed, have used, not only against *Bishops*, but *Patriarchs*, and the *Clergy* joined with them); And the Churches Decrees, thus, will be necessarily obligatory never, but when the Governours thereof (to a *man*, or to every *particular Church*, or Society of Church-men) are all of a mind. Neither can the people, (when the Ecclesiastical Court, (which consists of many Judges) is any way divided, tell, which to obey, if our Saviours Promise be only to some certain Guides, we know not in how small a number, because they know not, whether our Saviours *promise* of Indefectibility even in necessaries belongs not to the more inconsiderable part thereof. He that appoints us to follow a Guide in what it shall enjoin us, and then leaves us no way (when our Guide consists not of one, but many persons, and particular Churches; and when two parties of them contradict one another, and guide us contrary wayes) to know, which of them is to be our Guide; it is all one, as if he left us no Guide: and he that ties us, besides our own judgment, in doubtful matters to obey, and follow, only some Ecclesiastical person or other, not obliging us to the most, or major part, to the

Superiour

Superiour rather, than an inferior, person, or Court, revolves our obedience, in any division of our Governours, only to our own Judgment; (*i. e.*) to chuse that side which we judge is most conformable to Scripture; as we follow the Counsel of that friend, who, we think, speaks most *reason*, (But can this be called any *obebedience* to his *authority*?) and then, left to this choice, what opinion can our selves take up, that is so absurd, in which we cannot finde some *Clergy* or other for our *Leaders*?

This concerning these Protestant-Divines, allowing an absolute Promise of Indefectibility (as to Necessaries) made to, and always verified in, *some Persons*, or also *some Body*, and Society, or other, of the Clergy, *i.e.* of the Church-Guides; but not to these always in such a capacity, as that they are, in the Churches constitutions and traditions, to be our Guides; these Orthodox-Guides (as they suppose) being perhaps in some Ages, a very small number, nor those of the highest rank, in comparison of the rest.

CHAP. V.

III. *Other Expressions of Protestant-Divines, granting the Churches Prelacie, as defining her Doctrines, Or the General Councils of them, to be unerrable in Necessaries, when accepted by the Church Universal* §. 32. *The Expressions of* * *Dr.* Potter §. 33. * *Of Bishop* Bramhall §. 34. *Where, concerning what Judgment of the Church sufficiently obligeth her subjects, in respect, 1st, of the Church-Catholick diffusive* §. 36. n. 1. *2ly, of Councils General* §. 36. n. 3. *3ly, of Councils Occidental* §. 36. n. 8. *Where, particularly of the Freedom of the Council of* Trent §. 36. n. 9. * *Of Bishop* Lawd §. 37. *Where, concerning what acceptation of Councils by the Church-diffusive is only necessary* §. 38. * *Of Dr.* Field §. 40.

§. 32. III. 3. Other expressions of Protestant-Divines, granting the Churches Clergy, as defining her doctrines, Or the General Councils of them, to be unerrable in necessaries: But then only, when universally accepted, no considerable persons, or at least Churches, dissenting.

III. BUt thirdly, several other *Expressions* may be found in some of them, wherein they would seem to go further yet, and to allow; That the Church-Catholick taken in general, or in her *greatest Body* of Clergy, as she is a *Canonical Guide*, and as she teacheth and *defineth* doctrines, can never err in Necessaries or Fundamentals. But, whether all their expressions cohere one with another; or whether their opinion, when strongly assaulted, will not retreat and resolve it self into the first, or second, already explained, I conclude nothing.

§. 33. Expressions Of Dr. Potter.

For this, see, first, that of Dr. *Potter*, §. 2. *p.* 28.——Where he saith,——*The Church Catholick is confessed in some sence* [(*i. e.*) in Fundamentals, as he explaineth it afterward, §. 5. *p.* 148, *&c.*] *to be unerring: and he is litle better than a Pagan that despiseth her* judgment. *For she follows her Guides, the Prophets and Apostles: and is not very free and forward in her* Definitions. [Here we hear of *Definitions*, and *Judgment* of the Church Catholick that are to be followed; Therefore (I infer) that such judgment may be known.] So §. 4. *p.* 97. ——*The Catholick Church* (saith he) *is careful to ground all her* Declarations *in matters of* Faith, *upon the Divine authority of Gods written Word; and therefore whosoever wilfully oppoſeth a* judgment *so well grounded is justly esteemed an Heretick.* [Then he addeth] *not properly, because he disobeys the Church; but because he yields not to Scripture sufficiently propounded, or cleared unto him.* [Where I do not see, but that whoso believeth this in general (as all ought) that the Church Catholick alwaies groundeth her Declarations, in matters of Faith, on Divine Authority, though every particular Declaration of hers is not *cleared* to him, that it is so well grounded, yet must needs wilfully, and self-convicted, *oppose* her judgment, and so incur *Heresie*; But, however he is, or is not, an Heretick, who dissents from such Decrees; yet, by the Doctor, all those, it seems, are secured, as for necessary Truth, that do obey and adhere to them.] And (§ 5. *p.* 169.) ——*If in any thing* (saith he) *General Councils erre and mistake; the Universal Church hath means of remedy, either by antiquating those Errors with a* general *and* tacit *consent*, [*General Consent*: therefore such Decree of a General Council, to render it non-obligatory, must be, at least tacitly, reversed by a *major part* of the Church Catholick; else, if any single Church's reversion serves the turn to annull the Obligation thereof, no Churches are obliged to such Decrees further than they please.] *Or by representing her self again in another General Council, which may view, and correct the Defects of the former.* [Here are two ways of the Church Catholick's correcting the Errors of her Representative, the Council. 1. Either by, generally, not observing, or practising their Decrees. 2. Or by condemning them by another Representative: therefore I gather, where the Church Catholick neither by another general Council *contradicts* such assembly; nor, in her most general practice, or Doctrines, *varies* from its Decrees, the definitions and judgment of such a General Council are admitted as the definitions and judgment of the Church Catholick: Or else there is no way of knowing *what*, or *which*, are so.] —*Ib.* After that (*p.* 141.) he hath spoken of the present Church-Catholick,

tholick, *her being as a Candlestick to present, and hold out the light to us*; and (p. 143.) *of her being a Witness, and an Instrument for working Faith in us*; he (p. 148, 149, 156.) accords, as he saith, with some moderate Roman Writers, *That the Extent of the Infallibility of this Church* [i. e. in defining, p. 156.] *reacheth to all matters Essential and fundamental, simply necessary for the Church to know and believe. But, not so to all her Doctrines, and Definitions.*--- And, p. 155. *The Universal Church* (saith he) *hath not the like assurance from Christ, that she shall not erre in unnecessary additions, as she hath for her not erring in taking away from the Faith What is fundamental, and necessary*: [Where, *Defining*, *Adding*, *Taking away*, &c. argue, that he speaks here of the present Church Catholick, (which he affirms to be infallible in Fundamentals,) in relation to the *main Body* of her *Governour's* being so.]

§. 34. Of *Bishop Bramhall.*

Bishop *Bramhall* ‖ speaks much what on the same manner.—*If* (saith he) *of two particular Churches, the one retain a communion with the Universal Church, and be ready to submit to the* Determinations *thereof*; *the other renounce the communion of the Universal Church, and contumaciously despise the* Jurisdiction *and* Decrees *thereof, the former continues* Catholick, *and the latter becomes* Schismatical; Or as he expresseth it, in *Schism-guarded*, p. 2.-*That Church which shall not outwardly acquiesce, after a Legal Determination, and cease to disturb the Christian Unity, though her Judgment may be sound, yet her practice is schismatical.*—And afterward.—*We are most ready in all our differences to stand to the Judgment of the truly Catholick Church, and its lawful Representative, a free General Council.* [Here the Bishops submitting and standing to the *judgment*, and determinations of the *Church Universal*, or a *free General Council*, were it now called, argues him to hold the present Church Catholick, in such Councils, as a Guide, and Lawgiver; infallible in Fundamentals; or at least whose judgment in all points is finally to be stood to so far, as not to contradict it; and his pronouncing *Schismaticks* to be no *Catholicks*, argues, that this Church Universal may be also narrower, than Christianity is] Add to this, what he saith below, p. 26.--*That, by disbelieving any Fundamental Article, or necessary part of saving Faith, in that sense, in which it was evermore received, and believed by the Universal Church, a man renders himself guilty of* Heresie. [Here he declares one an *Heretick* not only in his disbelieving a necessary point of Faith, but in disbelieving it in that *sense*, wherein the Church Catholick hath always believed it: which sense (in the former quotation) he holds, is to be received, and learned from her Councils.] Again; In his Reply to the Bishop of *Chalcedon*, speaking of the Catholick Church

‖ Vin dic. 2 c. p. 9.

Church in present Being, he saith, ‖ —— *I do from my heart submit to all things which the true Catholick Church diffused over the world doth believe and practise.*— And afterward —— *Though I have no reason in the world to suspect my present judgment, I do farther profess my readiness to submit to the right Catholick Church,* [in present being] *whensoever God shall be pleased to reveal it to me,* and— *Ibid.* in the Preface —— *I submit* (saith he) *my self, and my poor endeavours, first to the judgment of the Catholick, Oecumenical, Essential Church.*---*And if I should mistake the right Catholick Church out of humane frailty, or ignorance (which for my part I have no reason to suspect, yet it is not impossible,* &c.) [therefore Catholick doth not necessarily include all Sects professing Christianity] *I do implicitly, and in the preparation of my mind, submit my self to the true Catholick Church; the Spouse of Christ; the Mother of the Saints; the pillar of Truth.* —— And after this, he professeth---- *That his adherence is firmer to the infallible Rule of Faith, (the holy Scriptures)* interpreted *by this Catholick Church* [*i. e.* firmer to its interpretation] *than to his own private judgment*---So, in his Reply to *S. W.* p. 43.— *We acknowledge* (saith he) *the Representative Church, that is, a General Council; and the Essential Church, that is, the multitude, or multitudes of Believers, either of all ages, which make the Symbolical Church; or of this age, which makes the present Catholick Church.*--And *Ib.*--*We are ready to believe, and practise, whatsoever the Catholick Church even of this present Age, doth universally believe, and practise* ‖.[Surely, from these Protestations it follows; *that he supposeth that such a Church there is in this present age, that may deliver her judgment: Else his promise to *believe*, and to *submit* to it, is utterly unsignificant; and *that he holds this Church not errable in Fundamentals, else her judgment in them could not by him be safely followed.

‖ p. 279.

‖ See Schism guarded, p. 398.

§. 35. n. 1. —And if you would know also, what present Body he understandeth by this present Catholick Church, to which he will yield his submission and beliefe, he tells the Bishop of *Chalcedon* ‖ *That it is not the Church of* Rome *alone with all its Dependents; but the Church of the Whole world,* Roman, Grecian, Armenian, Abyssine, Russian, Protestant, *which Churches,* [i. e. Grecian, *&c.*] *are three times greater than the* Roman *is. But, if you think the present Church Catholick, in this vast amplitude, a Judge not likely to resolve his doubts*; He in the Preface to his Reply to the Bishop of *Chalcedon*, very conscientiously adds also,--- *I submit my self to the Representative Church, a free General Council, or so general, as can be procured*: And in pursuance of the same Notion of *General*, (*Schisme Guarded*, p. 350.) he saith,---*That the presence of the*

‖ p. 279.

five

five Proto-Patriarchs, and their Clergy, either in their persons, or by their Suffrages, or, in case of necessity, the greater part of them do make a General Council. — And — *That we may well hope, that God who hath promised, that where two or three are gathered together in his Name, there will he be in the midst of them, will vouchsafe to give his assistance, and his blessing to such a Council, which is as general as may be; although perhaps it be not so exactly general, as hath been; or might have been now, if the Christian Empire had flourished still: as it did anciently. In summe, That he shall ever be ready to acquiesce in the Determination of a Council so General as is possible to be had; so it may be equal,* &c. Naming several conditions thereof; — *Equal Votes of Christian Nations* — *Absents sending their Suffrages,* — *The place free, whither all parties may have secure access, and liberty to propose freely, and define freely* — yet consenting‖ — *That none declared Hereticks by former true General Councils be admitted to any vote in them; and* ‖ *that all those be held for excluded from the communion of the Catholick Church, whom undoubted General Councils have excluded.* He addes yet further, reflecting on Dr. *Hammond's* words ‖ — *That Oecumenical, or General Councils are now morally impossible to be had; The Christian world being under so many Empires* [and some of them enemies to the Christian Religion] *and divided into so many Communions, that it is not visible to the eye of man how they should be regularly assembled.* I say here he adds ‖, — *That because it is not credible, that the Turk will send his Subjects, that is, four of the Proto-Patriarchs with their Clergy to a General Council, or allow them to meet openly with the rest of Christendom in a General Council, it being a thing so much against his own Interest; that therefore, if these Patriarchs do deliver the Sense and Suffrages of their Churches by Letters, or by Messengers, this is enough to make a Council General.* — And — *That, as there have been General Oriental Councils without the personal presence of a Western Bishop; so there may be an Occidental Council* [I add *General*] *without the Personal Presence of one Eastern Bishop, by the sole communication of their Sense and their Faith.*

‖ p. 352. ‖ p. 401. ‖ Answ. to Catho. Gentl. 3 c. §. 1. ‖ Schisme guarded, p. 352.

And, for the calling also of this General Council, he §. 35. n. 2. saith ‖, — *That if the Pope have any right, either to convocate General Councils himself, or to represent to Christian Soveraigns the fit Seasons for Convocation of them, either in respect of his beginning of unity, or of his Proto-Patriarchate, he doth not envy it him, since there may be a good use of it, in respect of the division of the Empire; so good caution be observed.* — And before, *p.* 91. he saith, — *That at present he will not dispute, whether the Bishop of* Rome *by his reputed Primacy of Order, or beginning of Unity, may lawfully call an*

‖ *Ib.* p. 356.

Oecu-

Oecumenical, or Occidental Council by power purely spiritual, which consists rather in advice, than in mandates properly so called; or in mandates of courtesie, not coactive in the exterior Court of the Church: that, considering the division, and subdivision of the ancient Empire; and the present distraction of Christendom, it seemeth not altogether inconvenient. That the Primitive Fathers did assemble Synods, *and* make Canons, *before there were any Christian Emperors; but that was by authority meerly spiritual; they had no coactive power to compel any man against his will; and the uttermost they could do, was to separate him* [I suppose, he meaneth who contemned their summons, or their Canons] *from their communion, and to leave him to the coming or judgment of Christ.* Ib. p. 120. He seems to allow the Church-Governours a right *to summon Councils, where there are no Christian Soveraigns to do it,* [i. e. that will do it] *and to make Canons such as the Primitive Bishops made, before there were Christian Emperors.* [Only I hope he will, consequently, allow further (what was done also by these Church-Governours in the Primitive times;) that, if Ecclesiastical Governors have authority, as need requires, to summon such a Meeting, they may appoint some place for it; which place will always be in some Princes temporal Dominions; and that, if they may make Canons, they may divulge, and send abroad their Laws, and Canons to the Church's Subjects, upon spiritual censures inflicted on the disobedient; which must be also amongst some temporal Prince his Subjects; for so did the Governors of the first Council ‖ appoint the place of their Meeting, *Hierusalem*; and sent abroad their Canons amongst the Emperors Subjects; both, contrary to the then secular Powers; and this without entrenching on any ones Politick Rights.]

‖ Act. 15.

§. 35. n. 3. The Bishop having condescended to thus much concerning General Councils; he yields further ‖; *That, until such Council* [the most general that is procurable] *he submits himself to the Church of* England, *wherein he was baptized, or to a National* English *Synod.* But here he makes too great a leap, (though perhaps he had some reason for it) in removing his Submission immediately from a *General,* to a *National* Synod of his own Church; for between these lies a *Patriarchal,* or Occidental Synod, to which he ought to submit; the just authority also of which, above a National Synod, he elsewhere both freely maintaineth ‖; and, though not here, yet elsewhere, he also refers his trial to it.——*There is nothing* (saith he, *Schism Guarded,* p. 136.) *that we long after more, than a General Council rightly called rightly proceeding; or, in defect of that, a free Occidental Council, as Ge-*

‖ Reply to *Chalced.* præfat.

‖ Vindic. of the Church of *England,* P. 258.

neral

neral as may be, But then, we would have the Bishop to renounce that Oath [to the Pope] *that hath been obtruded upon them.* Lastly, Concerning the quality of Obedience due to *such* Councils, even in *non-fundamentals*, he saith ||, —*That, as to Questions non-fundamental, when these are once defined by a lawful General Council, all Christians, though they cannot* assent *in their judgment, are obliged to* passive *Obedience, to possess their souls in patience. And they who shall* oppose *the Authority, and disturb the Peace of the Church, deserve to be punished as* Hereticks; where also he makes this *the fourth way of rendring ones self guilty of Heretical pravity*, I suppose because, though the Councils Determination in his opinion makes no point Heresie, yet at least it equals the crime of the *Opposer* to that of an *Heretick*.

|| Vindic. of the Church of *Engl.* p. 27.

§. 36. n. 1. *Reply.* Where. Conc. what Judgment of the Church sufficiently obligeth.

I have been somewhat copious in giving you the condescensions of this Bishop, not to make advantage of what a single Author indulgeth, but because they seem no greater than reason requireth, and what all Protestants, allowing a *Church-Government*, ought to stand to; and therefore I desire your leave, before I proceed to some other quotations, to reflect a little on this submission of the Bishop's, and to see how far it, truly performed, will rationally carry him, or others, towards a present settlement in many of the points controverted. 1st. Then; This I presume here ought to be granted me, that, in the Bishop's, or others professing a submission to the *General*, or *Unanimous*, accord of the Church Catholick in any Doctrine, or Practise, this accord ought not to be taken so strictly, either for what is *defined* by *Councils*, or *accepted* by the *Church diffusive*, as that, if any particular Person, Church, or Party, (perhaps his own) that is held Catholick, dissent in any thing from all the rest, being a much major part in respect thereof, and joined also with the supreme Pastor of the Catholick Church, and Primate of the Patriarchs, he shall account himself discharged from Obedience, or deny such a Consent to be *sufficiently* General and Unanimous to oblige him. Concerning which, see more *Disc.* 2. §. 25. and before §. 31.

§. 36. n. 2.

2. This premised; Come we now to the Bishops submissions, which are promised, 1st. To the present Church Catholick, *viz.* To all things universally believed, or practised by it, 2ly. To Free General, 3ly. Or also free Occidental Councils. Which to review in their Order.

1st. Here he professeth ||—*We are ready to believe and practise whatsoever the* Catholick Church *of this* present *Age doth believe and practise*: Here, if he meaneth, the Protestants are ready to *believe*

In respect of the Church Catholick diffusive.

|| Schism

Guarded, p. 983

lieve, and *practise* whatsoever *all* the Catholick Church of this present Age, *besides them*, doth believe, and practise, and understands a Consent of this Catholick Church according to the former explication thereof, which is but reasonable; Then 1st. I refer you to what is said in the third Discourse, §. 26: whether, for the most of the modern Controversies, the whole Catholick Church, I mean the main body both of the *Oriental*, and *Occidental* Churches, (especially as to the Guides, and Governours thereof, who only have authority of voting, and giving Laws in the Church's highest Consultations, and to whose Judgment Inferiours in spiritual matters ought to conform) at the coming of *Luther*, did not, and do not still, agree in their opinion in many things, now opposed by Protestants, and then by *Luther*, and a few others; who sided not with, or joined themselves to, any, though lesser, part of the then Church-Governours, Eastern, or Western, but freely acknowledged their discession *à toto mundo*. See below, §. 55. n. 4.

‖ *Præfat. de de abroganda Missa privata.*

'Which made *Luther* sometimes thus to utter the Objections 'of his Conscience within, and of the Church without—*Quot* 'medicamentis (saith he ‖) *quam potentibus, & evidentissimis Scri-* 'pturis meam ipsius conscientiam vix dùm stabilivi, *ut auderem unus* 'contradicere Papæ, *& credere eum esse Antichristum, Episcopos* 'ejus esse Apostolos, Academias esse ejus Lupanaria? *Quoties mihi* 'palpitavit tremulum cor, *& reprehendens objecit eorum fortissimum* '& unicum Argumentum? *Tu solus sapis? Totne errant universi?* —And elsewhere ‖—'*Ecclesia sic sentit, & credit; Impossibile*

‖ In Galat. 1. 11, 12.

'est autem, quòd Christus tot sæculis Ecclesiam suam errare sinat. *Tu* 'certè solus non sapis plus, *quam tot sancti viri, & tota Ecclesia*—— 'And—*Sanctissimæ Catholicæ Ecclesiæ authoritatem amamus illæ-* 'sam *Ea tot sæculis sic sentit, & docuit; sic senserunt, & docue-* 'runt omnes primitivæ Ecclesiæ doctores, viri sanctissimi multo majores, '& doctiores te. *Quis tu es, qui ausis, ab omnibus his dissentire, &* 'nobis diversum dogma obtrudere? To which the summe of the 'Answer he gives (I pray you see the place) is—*Neq; mihi, neq;* 'Ecclesiæ, neque Patribus, neque Apostolis, neque Angelo è Cœlo cre- 'dendum est, si quid contra Dei verbum docemus.—And—*Quisq;* 'igitur videat, *ut* certissimus *sit de suâ vocatione, &* doctrina. As 'for those Answers * of Dr. *Field* ‖,—*That the Doctrines, which*

* p. 82. 880.

'Luther, and the Protestants oppose, were not the generally received 'Doctrines of the present Catholick Church, but only of a prevalent 'Faction in it*; Or * of Mr *Stillingfleet* ‖,—*That, if they were*

‖ p. 368.

'Doctrines generally received, yet they were not* Catholick Doctrines,

‹ ctrines, *but generally received in the nature of an* Opinion: I ſay, ‹ ſuch Anſwers were not then thought on; or not thought fit to be ‹ made uſe of. For what ground is there, to call all thoſe Church- ‹ Governours of the preſent Age that have power to vote in Coun- ‹ cils, and ſteer the Church, only a *prevalent Faction* in it? Or to ‹ ſay thoſe Doctrines, or Practices, which none could then oppoſe ‹ without incurring the Church's Cenſures, (for ſo *Luther* and ‹ others did, before the Council of *Trent*), were only generally re- ‹ ceived in the nature of *an Opinion.*] 2ly. But next; if all the points, that are pretended, are not found to have been generally *believed*, or *practiſed* in the Church-Catholick at *Luthers* appearance; yet if *two* or *three* of them appear to be ſo; according to the Biſhops Conceſſion here, to ſo many will the Proteſtants ſtand obliged in a conformity of their *Belief*, and *Practice*; nor can they excuſe their diſſent from theſe, becauſe a diſſent in more than theſe is falſely laid to their charge. But 3ly. If at leaſt what is *contained* in the publick *Liturgies*, and *Miſſals* (to which all are obliged to conform) both of the Eaſtern, and Weſtern Church may be ſaid to be of univerſal Belief, and Practice, Proteſtants, by this Profeſſion, are bound, *herein* at leaſt, to believe, and practice with the reſt, And why then, do they compoſe *new* Liturgies? why abſent themſelves from *the old*? Is it not, that theſe contain ſomthing in them, to which they cannot thus conform? 4. Laſtly, For points no way *enjoined*, yet if ſuch (either ſpeculative, or practical) do appear, ſo far as our Examination can diſcover to us, not only to be tolerated, but *juſtified*, and *maintained* either by the whole, or a much major part of the Church Catholick united with the Prime Apoſtolick Chair, it ſeems here neceſſary, that no particular perſon, or Church, do *decretally* cenſure any ſuch Points as Errors in Doctrine, or Practice; or do any way oblige their Inferiors to think, or profeſs them to be ſo, which this much major part alloweth, and practiſeth. If liberty to think, teach, or practice otherwiſe, according to their Opinion, in a point yet no way defined, or enjoyned, may be granted to ſuch a minor part; yet not a liberty to define *againſt* it, or pronounce it an *Errour* in matter of *Faith*; for this cannot be done without ſuch minor condemning the much major part, joined with the prime Patriarch; which ſmall part's condemning both the ſuperiour, and much greater, if it be allowed, deſtroies Church-Government.

2. After this firſt Submiſſion. wherein the Biſhop ſeems to engage the Proteſtants *Belief*, and *Practice* to any thing which is generally

§. 36. n. 3.

2. *Of Councils General.

generally believed, and practiced by the Catholick Church, though it be not also conciliarly defined; if, next, we come to the Church's *Councils*. Here also he makes fair promises of submission, (I mean as to external Obedience, and non-contradiction.) And 1st. In respect of a *Council General* he is not in every thing so nice, or exceptions, as some other Protestants be. He, 1st. not exacting, that this Council should be so absolutely general, as that any Hereticks should be admitted; such, as true General Councils have evidently declared to be Hereticks; or such as will not pronounce *Anathema* against all *old* Heresies ||, [I suppose he means, all which have been condemned for Heresies by undoubted General Councils.] 2ly Nor, that all the five Proto-Patriarchs should be present there, four of them, and their Clergy being under the power of the Turk; but granting it sufficient, if the sense, and Suffrages of them, and their Churches, be delivered by *Messengers*, or *Letters*. 3. As for the *calling* also of this Council, considering the division, and sub-division of the ancient Empire, and the present distraction of Christendom [*i. e.* as to the Princes thereof their altogether contrary Interests] he is well enough content, that the *prime Patriarch summon* it; [and then, upon this conceded, I think I may add, as evident from what is said before, §. 35. n. 2. that the same Patriarch may both appoint some *place* of meeting, and also, such Council met, *divulge*, and upon spiritual Censures, require to be observed, its *Decrees* concerning matters meerly spiritual, whether, meanwhile, the secular Powers favour, or frown; I say, *appoint some place*; which place, since it must be within the Dominions, and under the Power of some particular Prince, and farther distant from some particular Churches than others, it cannot be expected, that it shall ever be so fitly chosen, as equally to serve all Interests, or remedy all Inconveniences; and therefore supposing, free access, free proposal, and voting, for all Prelates that come, the *post-acceptation* must make amends for the necessity of many Prelat's, or also Church's, *absence*.

|| Schism guarded, p. 352.

[§. 36. n. 4. Things thus far conceded by him concerning General Councils, that, which I have chiefly to except against, is this. 1st. In his reckoning up the Clergy of the *Roman*, *Grecian*, *Armenian*, *Abyssine*, *Russian*, *Protestant* Churches, as constituting the entire body of such a general Council, and affirming, that the rest of them are a body three times greater than the *Roman*, including the Western Churches joined with it ||, he seems much to miscount. For 1st. *Several* of the Protestant Churches, *viz.*

|| See before § 35.

so

so many as have deposed Bishops, and constituted a Presbyterial Government, for any thing I can see, are very clearly concluded by Dr. *Hammond*, and Dr. *Ferne*, to be Schismaticks; and that from, and against, their *Spiritual Superiours*; which Schisme excludes them from being true Members of the Church Catholick, or having place in her General Councils, especially, since their Clergy also are no Bishops, (See Bishop *Bramhall*, *Vindic. of the Church of* England, *p.* 9. opposing Catholick, and Schismatical, as he doth elsewhere Catholick, and Heretical.) But then, as for the *Bishops* of other Protestant Churches, neither can they escape the same imputation of *Schisme* by the same Dr. *Hammonds* Concession, if those *Councils* (mentioned below, §. 50. n. 2.) whose Authority, and Decrees they have rejected, be truly their *Superiours*; nor yet *Heresie* in the Catholick account, or perhaps in Bishop *Bramhall's* (considering what he saith, *Vindic. of the Church of* England, *p.* 27. quoted before, §. 36. and *Schism Guarded*, p. 352.) if any of these Councils be *Legally General*.

‖ See Disc. 2. § 24. n. 2.

2. Next: As for several of those Eastern, and Southern Churches that are brought in by the Bishop to enlarge the Church Catholick in comparison of the *Roman*-Catholick, they are a Mass of many several Sects (of which see what is said more at large in *Disc.* 3. §. 1. 76, &c.) such as, after the Council of *Chalcedon*, some sooner, some later, deserting their former Patriarch, have since ranged themselves under several Patriarchs of their own, residing in several Cities of the East; the different Sects having set up in later times, without any Conciliar Authority acting in it, no less than seven or eight *Independent* Patriarchs. They stand divided both from the *Latine* and *Greek* Church, and also from one another, in several Tenents concerning *our Lord's*, *Person*, *Natures*, *and Wills*; many of those dispersed in the more *Eastern* parts, *Assyria*, *Mesopotamia*, &c. suspected (as Dr. *Field* acknowledgeth) of *Nestorianisme* somwhat qualified; many of the *Southern*, as the *Egyptians*, or *Cophtites*, *Ethiopians*, or *Abyssines*, (as to their Religion dependent on the former) suspected (as the same Dr. *Field* relateth ‖) of *Eutychianisme*, or rather of *Dioscorism* (who was Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and condemned in the Council of *Chalcedon*); divers of them also, amongst other extravagant Rites, retaining *Circumcision*. If this then be true, which this Doctor relates; though they be not *perfect Eutychians* and *Nestorians* in their Opinions, yet such they are, as do transgress against the Faith, and Definitions, of the third and fourth General Council; the later of which Councils the greatest body of them

§. 36. n. 5.

‖ Of the Church, p. 62.

‖ Ib. p. 64, 66.

expresly

expresly rejects (See Dr. *Field*, p. 70, 71.) No reason then can Bp. *Bramhall* have, to admit these to a *Suffrage* in a Catholick General Council. And if it be said ||, that most of them, in such illiterate Regions, are only, through invincible ignorance, *material*, not *formal*, Hereticks; and therefore are not so unmercifully to be cut off from the Catholick Church, it is to be remembred; that we speak not here of cutting off either them (or also Protestants) so many as are invincibly ignorant, from being *internally* still members of the Church, and of the Body of Christ, and possibly capable of salvation; but of their having *externally* no right (being involved in such Tenents) to officiate in the Government of the Church, or vote in its Councils; from which Councils in expelling Hereticks, the Church can only look to the external profession thereof; and to which suppose a Material Heretick admitted, his *ignorance* would be, as to voting, as much the bane of Truth there, as the formal Hereticks *pertinacy*.

|| See Dr. *Field*, l. 3. c. 5.

§. 36. n. 6. But 3ly. were they never so good Catholicks; yet their Body and bulk, (taking in the *Greek Church* also) as for those residing in the Turks dominions, is far from being so considerably great, as it is made. Where, especially for the former Prelacy, the oppression is so great, these Dignities so set to sale, and their means and revenue so alienated, and most of the Metropolies in *Asia* so ruin'd, as that the bare title (only now descending) of many of the Ancient Sees is neglected, and the succession in them ceased: And, though the territory is much vaster, yet it may reasonably be presumed, that, abstracting those which in these parts are adherents to the Roman Communion (as the *Marointes* a long time have been) there are more Canonical Prelates, and perhaps Christians, in some small part of *Europe*, than there are throughout all *Turky*; where also the chief Supporters of the Christian-Religion are mostly *Regulars* and *Monks*, no welcom Colleagues for the Protestants to join with. The chief and most united Body of these Eastern Christians is in *Greece*, which *Boterus* (but long ago) conjectured might make up two thirds of the inhabitants there; And, as for those more remote, divers of them, by the diligent missions of several Religious Orders of the Roman Profession out of *Europe* into those parts, (who, by the Merchants help, procure houses of constant residence there) have been from time to time reduced to the Unity of the Roman faith and communion, as appears in the relation of these Missions. See *Spondan. Annal. A.D.* 1616. 8. and Dr. *Field* p. 63. what hath hapned in the more Eastern Churches since *A.D.* 1550. And as their number

|| See *Brerewoods Inquiries*. 10. c. —*Botero Relat Universal*— *Rel. del. Gr. Turco.*

small

small, so is learning there, by reason of extreme poverty, very much decayed ||. So that he must now adhere to the Western, who would adhere either to the *major*, part of Christianity, or to the *learned*. And it seems a great tergiversation and distrust in their cause, for any person, or Church, of this Western-flourishing Body, to fly and retire to such remote Confederates, some of them almost our Antipodes: and to decline the judgment (that is easily had) of the same Western-Body, which hath a *Conclusive* authority, in respect of any part thereof, for controversies arising within this Patriarchat; and which was alwayes, by reason of the Presidency of S. *Peters* chair, the most dignified part of *Christendom*; and is the most free at this present time in their exercise of Religion; the most unmolested in their Government and Discipline; the most flourishing in Learning and Records of Antiquity; and lastly, which by their numerous Clergy, and Populacy. and the extent also of several members of their Body into all those parts, where these other Churches reside, do seem by much the greatest part of Christianity.

|| See *Roger. Recollect. Terr. Sanctæ* 2 *l. Tract.* 4, 5. — *Thomas à Jesu de conv. Gent.* — 6 *l.* p 285.

4. But 4ly, how numerous soever these Eastern Christians be, or how good their title to give their Suffrages in Councils, yet, there seems no great advantage, that can arise to the Protestant-party hence, all these Churches in their publick Liturgies, Doctrines, and Rites, as to the Protestant-controversies, much what agreeing with the *Greek* Church ||; and *this* again with the *Roman*.

§. 36. n. 7.

|| See 3d Disc. §. 158. &c. — 177. &c.

5. Lastly, this *consent* and *agreement* of the *Greek*, and other *Eastern* Churches, or the greatest part of them, with the *Roman* in the forenamed Controversies, appearing in their Liturgies, Writings, common Practices, and these not borrowed from the West, between which, and them, there is known to have been for many Ages no great Friendship, seems sufficient to render the Occidental Councils, wherein these Points have been decided, either *General*, or *Equivalent* thereto, without those *Letters* or *Messages* which the Bishop requires as necessary from these Churches; which *Letters* depend on the assembling of some inferior Synods *Diocesan*, or *Provincial*, among them; a thing, in so great a Desolation, not to be expected. Yet, before the *Turks* last Conquests, in some of these *Western* Councils, that have determined some of these points, there hath been a considerable Representative of the Eastern Churches; as in the *Great Lateran* Council under *Innocent*, and in the *Florentine*. So then stands the case with the Bishop and other Protestants, that, yielding submission to Gene-

ral

ral Councils, they cannot rightly on this account withdraw it from ſeveral Councils that have been aſſembled in the Weſt in later Ages,

3. But next, this Biſhop profeſſeth himſelf to ſubmit alſo to the Sentence of an *Occidental* Council, if a *free* one; ſo that we need not further trouble our ſelves to enquire after a more General, but ſearch, if any ſuch free Occidental Council hath defined all, or any of the preſent Controverſies, which Council he obligeth the Proteſtant Churches to acquieſce in; and that with good reaſon: For the ſame Authority hath a *Patriarchal* Council over the *National* Churches, and Synods of the Weſt, as theſe claim over *Provincial*, or *Dioceſan*; the authority of which *National* Synods ſee eſtabliſhed in the Synod under King *James*, 1603. *Can.* 139, 140. And the ſame Authority of *Patriarchal* granted by Dr. *Field*, and others, *Diſc.* 2. §. 24. Now *Occidental* Councils there have been many, ſeveral of them before *Luther*'s days, one ſince, that have decreed and given their Sentence in ſeveral, if not all, of thoſe Points of Controverſie, of which yet the Proteſtants do ſtill, from a *free* Occidental Council, ſeek reſolution ||. The enquiry then remains concerning their *freedom*, where alſo I ſuppoſe no greater freedom needs be proved, than, as to the particular Controverſies defined againſt Proteſtants; For a Council, to which ſome violence is offered in one thing, which perhaps is, by ſome potent perſons therein, contended for, yet may be left altogether free as to many other things, wherein none have any particular, or all, an equal, intereſt, 1ſt. Then, If we enquire into the Weſtern Councils before *Luther*, that of *Franckfort*; (Miſtakes being removed, concerning which, ſee Mr. *Thorndike* ‖ and Dr. *Hammond*'s ‖ Conceſſions) the great *Lateran* Council, and thoſe *five* preceding it, (that defined a ſubſtantial converſion in the Euchariſt;) the Council of *Conſtance*; and that of *Florence*, I find nothing objected againſt their freedom, nor any antifaction then in the Church, as to the *Points* we ſpeak of, againſt whom there was any need to procure in the Council a ſtronger part, or to over-awe any ones liberty: Nor ſee I any neceſſity of force to be uſed upon the Fathers for voting thoſe things lawful, which were their daily practice, or for voting ſuch a thing a truth in their Meeting (as that of a ſubſtantial converſion in the Euchariſt,) which before their convening (though agitated much, and contradicted by ſome Inferiors, yet) not one Biſhop in the Catholick Church of thoſe times oppoſed. And

if

§. 36. n. 8.

* 3. Of Councils Occidental.

‖ See below, § 50. n. 2.

¶ *Epilog* l. 3. p. 363.

‖ Of Idolatry § 57.

if the *paucity* of the number of Western Bishops in some of these Councils should be alledged as a prejudice to them, the *general acceptation* of them by those times makes a sufficient amends for it.

Next, if we take into consideration the freedom of that of *Trent*, since *Luthers* time, according to the particulars required by the Bishop||, there are four things sufficient to remove our jealousie of any violence used for the defining *most* of those points (I will not say *all*, to avoid some cavils) controverted by Protestants, concerning which only is our inquiry. The 1st is; That however some of those points may be pretended to have bin voted at first as it were *surreptitiously* by a very *small* Body of *Bishops*, and many of those of *one* Nation; yet both a *full Body* of *Bishops* afterwards in the Conclusion of the Council, unanimously agreeing, ratified these; and the General Body of the absent Prelaces of all the Western Churches (except Protestants), and those of *France* amongst the rest, *accepted* them. The 2d, That *Soave*, no friend to this Council, yet testified, that, as to the *Protestant*, or *Lutheran* controversies, the votes of the Fathers of that Council were very *unanimous*, without any cloak-bag expected from *Rome*; without any dispute or contracts, either between themselves, or with the Pope, (though, about some other points, there was much.)

§. 36. n. 9.

|| Before §. 35 n. 1.

'See *Soave p.*230. where, speaking of the Councils using *ambiguity* of expression in some matters wherein was some diversity 'of opinion among the Fathers, so to satisfie all.—*But* (saith he) '*that which hath been related in this particular, & perhaps did happen* '*in many matters*, occurred not *in condemning the Lutheran opinions*, '*where* all *did* agree *with an* exquisite Unity—And see him *p.*324, 326. 'Concerning the Fathers *unanimous Votes* of the 2. and 6. 'Canons of the 13. Sess. touching *Transubstantiation* and *Adoration*—See *p.* 799. 803, their *General Agreement* and *Consent*, 'touching *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Images* —*p.*544, 554, 738. 'Touching the *Masse*, its being a *propitiatory sacrifice*, *&c.*—*p.*324, 325, 519. touching the lawfulness 'and sufficiency of *communicating only in one kind*—*p* 348. Touching the *necessity* of *Sacramental Confession* for mortal sin—*p.* 783, 747, 678, 679. 'touching the *lawfulness* of the *Vow of Continency*, an universal capacity of the Gift of Chastity, and injunction of *Priests Celibacy*. It were easie to add more.

The 3d, that without such a testimony, if any consider, that

§. 36. n. 10. the things defined, of which here is question, were most of them *common practices*, then, used by all these Prelates (before they were assembled in *Trent*,) in their several Dioceses, and so for many hundred years formerly; and that the question in the Council to be decided was, whether such practices *lawful?* [‘As ‘for instance, whether Communion only in one kind sufficient, and ‘*lawful*——whether Adoration of Christs Body in the Eucharist ‘as corporally present, *lawful*——whether offering the sacrifice ‘of the Masse, the Body and Blood of Christ corporally present, for ‘the living and the dead, *lawful*——whether a Relative-Veneration of Images; Prayer to Saints; Prayer for the dead, as better-‘able thereby in their present condition before the day of Judg-‘ment, be lawful. (I omit the speculative controversies concern-‘ing *Justification, Faith, Works, Merit, Works of supererogation, ‘Grace and Free-will, Certainty of salvation*, Now by the *mode-‘rate* as it were compounded, and laid aside, the Catholick-doctrine ‘being of late better understood by the reformed); Whether the ‘three Monastick Vows, as also the injunction of Celibacy to the ‘Priest, *lawful*:——whether Sacramental confession to the Priest ‘by those falling into mortal sin after their regeneration, not only ‘lawful, but necessary] I say, seeing that the question in the Council, in opposition to the new Lutheran doctrines, was, whether these things lawful, which were, then, and in many former Generations, daily practised (Protestants not denying it), what need of force; of new mandates from *Rome*; of hiring Suffrages; creating more titular Bishops; Oaths of obedience to the Pope, (which is only of *Canonical* obedience ||, and this Oath administred at their Consecration, without any relation to the Council) to procure a prevalent Vote, or that the *Prelats* should in the *Council* establish those things, several of which are found in their *Missals* and *Breviaries*, [as the *Sacrifice of the Masse*, *Adoration of Christs Corporal Presence* in the Eucharist, *Invocation of Saints*, *Prayer for the dead*, in the sence above-named]? But yet if these Fathers of the Council decided these things in such a manner, by compulsion, how came the many more absent Fathers of the Western Churches (and of *France* with the rest) so *freely* and *voluntarily* to *accept* them? But if it be said, that though such things were generally believed and practised before, yet now the Fathers, by Art and violence, were brought to advance them into *matters of Faith*; I ask concerning many of these points, what *faith* required, save that they are *lawful*, *beneficial*, *&c*? which *lawfulness* all those, that practised them *before*, (who were the most, if not all,) must also believe *before*, or else,

|| See *Bell. de Concil.* l. 1. c. 21.

(pra-

practised them against Conscience; and which *Lawfulness* Protestants denying, had, by this, fallen under the condemnation of this *Council*, had it voted nothing more, or besides *it*. Lastly, What *former* Council had there been in the Church, though never so *free*, that, for the matters called in question, and decided in it, had not in like manner required *Assent*, from the Church's Subjects, to their *Definitions*?

The 4th. That, though the Protestant Bishops, trespassing, in some points of their Reformation, against former *free Occidental* Councils (of which, see below. §. 50. n. 2.) therefore, (either upon the account of *Heresie*, or of *Schism*, forfeiting their Right) needed not to be admitted into this Council, yet, had they been received, and that not only to plead their cause, but also to a decisive Vote in the Council, yet the *small* number of them (some Protestant Churches also having no Bishops) had been inconsiderable in respect of the rest; and so, the determination of things would still have gone the same way. And indeed they were admitted to plead their Cause, both by a *safe Conduct* granted, and, when they came, no violence offered; But I cannot say on the other side, that no violence was offered to the *Council*, and that within three weeks after their coming, by the very Princes that sent them; who on a sudden appeared in Arms, against the *Emperor*, and by their near approach, dispersed this Assembly at *Trent*, after they had secretly withdrawn from thence their *Divines*. But, had their coming been serious, and their stay longer, what could they have *said* here, that they had not formerly *written*, and that the Council, in these Writings, had not perused? Or by what Arts could they have disswaded (as they desired ‖) this Venerable Assembly from taking, for their *Rule*, and *Guides*, in the Exposition of Scriptures, *the Apostolical Traditions*; *former Councils*, *and Fathers*, by which they were cast? Further, Suppose all things had been regulated in this Council, not by *Personal Consent*, but by the *Equal Votes* of the Western *Nations*, (though this is contrary to the *usual* manner; and never practised, save only in two late Councils after, *Anno Dom.* 1400. *Constance*, and *Basil*; and liable to many Inconveniences; of which, see *Considerations on the Council of* Trent, §. 72.) yet, if these *Votes* were truly adjusted, and proportioned, according to the several *Magnitude* of the Countries, and the *Multitude* of the Bishops in them, the Protestants also would by this way have been as much over-numbred, and over-born; which they well saw, and therefore never motioned it ‖. But motioned this, That,

§. 36. n. 11.

‖ Soave, P. 642.

* Soave, p. 42.

after their party first allowed with the rest a *decisive Vote*, *yet the Decisions in the Council should not be made by* plurality *of voices*, *but that the* more sound *Opinions should be preferred*; i. e. *those Opinions that were regulated by the Word of God*; (they are *Soave's* words ||, not mine.) And motioned yet a second thing ||;——*That*, *if a Concord in Religion could not be concluded in the Council*, *then the Conditions of* Passau, *and* Ausburge *might remain inviolable*. Now these were a *Toleration* of all Sects, that every one might follow, what *Religion* pleased him best. See *Soave*, 378, 393.—— And after this, motioned a third ||,——*That the body of the whole Western Clergy being now divided into* Plaintiffes [*the* Protestant *Clergy*,] *and* Defendants [*the* Catholick *Clergy*;] *and it not being just*, *that either of these should be the* Judge, *therefore that*, *the Divines on one part*, *and on the other*, *arguing for their own Tenents*, *there might be* Judges [*i. e.* Laicks] *indifferently chosen on both sides* [that is, in an equal number] *to take knowledge of the Controversies*. And see Mr. *Stillingfleet* motioning some such thing, *p.* 479. [And this indeed was the only way they had, in referring themselves to judgment, not to be cast, if the Judges of their own side, at least, would be true to them. But to let these things pass; As to a due proportion of *National* Votes, this Council of *Trent* is not to be thought deficient therein; whilst those Nations, who (by their own, if by any ones, fault) had fewer Votes in the Council in *passing* the Decrees, yet were as plenary, and numerous as the rest, in the *acceptation* of them, after it. And, were now anew these things put to an *equal Vote* of the Western Nations, I see not from what the *Protestants* may reasonably expect, supposing the greatest *liberty* in these Votes that is possible, an issue diverse from the former. For, have they any *new* thing to propose in their Orations, and Speeches before such a Meeting, that they have not already said in their Writings? And, notwithstanding, are not the major part of the *Occidental Clergy*, and the Learned, that peruse them, of a different judgment? And why should not *the others* have as great presumptions, upon an equal hearing, to pcevail for reducing some of the Protestant party, by *Scriptures*, explicated by *Apostolical Tradition*, *Councils*, and *Fathers*; as the Protestants of gaining some of the others, by *Scriptures* alone? Or, if any will say, that ancient Tradition, Councils, or Fathers, are on the Protestant side, how comes this to be one of their Articles proposed to the Council, that, all *Humane Authority* being excluded, the Holy *Scriptures* might be judge in the Council? And, the *Trent safe-Conduct* running thus; *Quod causæ controversæ secundum Sanctam*

|| *Ibid.*

|| *Soave*, Ibid

|| See *Soave*, p. 369.

Scripturam

Scripturam, Apostolorum Traditiones, probatæ Concilia, Sanctorum Patrum Authoritates, Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Consensum, tractentur, VVhy desired they a *freer* Safe conduct, after the form of that of *Basil* to the *Bohemians*? *Which if it had been granted* (saith *Soave* ||) *they had obtained one great point, that is, that the Controversies should be decided by the* Holy Scripture. This from §. 36. n. 1. I have said occasionally to Bishop *Bramhal's* so frequent free offers of Submission to the judgment of the *present* Catholick Church; or of free (*General*; or also *Occidental*) Councils. || p. 344.

Next come we to Arch-Bishop *Lawd.* He (§. 31. *p.* 318.) affirms;——*That, the* Visible *Church hath* in all Ages taught *that unchanged Faith of Christ in all points Fundamental.* Doctor *White* (saith he) *had reason to say this.*——And §. 21. *p.* 140.) ——*It is not possible the* Catholick Church [*i. e.* of any one Age] *should teach* [He speaks therefore of the *Governors* of it in such Age] *against the Word of God in things absolutely necessary to Salvation.*——And (§. 25. n. 4.) ——*If we speak of plain, and easie Scripture,* the whole Church *cannot at any time be without the knowledge of it.*——If *A. C.* means no more, than *that the whole universal Church of Christ cannot universally erre in any one point of Faith simply necessary to all mens Salvation, he fights against no Adversary that I know, but his own fiction. For the most learned* Protestants *grant it.* [VVhere he speaks of the Church as teaching such points; as appeareth by the Context]——*Ibid.* p. 139. ——*Because the* whole *Church cannot universally erre in absolutely fundamental Doctrines, therefore 'tis true also that there can be no just cause of making a* Schism *from the* whole *Church.*——*That she may err indeed in* Superstructions, *and Deductions, and other by-and* unnecessary Truths *from her* Curiosity *or other Weakness. But if she can err either by falling away from the foundation* [i. e. *by* Infidelity.] *or by* heretical *Errour in it, she can be no longer* holy; (*for no Assemblies of Heretick s can be holy*) *and so that Article of the Creed* [I believe the Holy Catholick Church] *is gone. Now this* Holiness (saith he) *Errors of a meaner allay take not away from the Church.*——Likewise (§. 33. n. 4. *p.* 256.) the same Archbishop saith yet more clearly——*That the whole Catholick Church Militant having an absolute Infallibility in the prime Foundations of Faith absolutely necessary to Salvation, if any thing sway, and wrench the* General Council [he must mean here, in non-necessaries; & such Council as is not universally accepted; for a General Council, universally accepted by the Church Catholick, is unerrable in necessaries, because the Church Catholick, he saith, §. 37. of Archbish. *Lawd.*

saith, is so] *upon* evidence *found in expres's Scripture, or* demonstration *of this miscarriage, hath power to represent her self in another body, or* [General] *Council, and to take order for what is amiss, either practised, or concluded in the former.*——*and to define against it,* p. 257.) ——And afterward, (*p.* 258.) ——*That thus, though the Mother-Church, Provincial, or National, may err, yet if the Grandmother, the* whole Universal *Church* [He means, in a general Council universally accepted] *cannot err in these* necessary *things, all remains safe; and all occasions of disobedience, taken from the* possibility of the Church's erring, *are quite taken away.* ——Again. §. 38. n. 14. he saith, *That, a General Council,* de post facto, *after it is ended, and* admitted *by the whole Church, is then* infallible.——And, for this admittance, or confirmation of it by the Church, he granteth ‖, *That, no confirmation is needful to a General Council lawfully called, and so proceeding, but only that, after it is ended, the whole Church admit it, though never so tacitly.)* The sum of all in brief is this; 1st. That, a General Council [or indeed any Council whatever, less than General] accepted, or admitted by the whole Church, is *infallible* in *Necessaries*, (the reason is plain, because he holds, the *whole Church* is so.) 2ly. Consequently that Obedience, and this, of *Assent*, is due to such Council, or to the judgment of the Church Catholick that is delivered by this Council, as to necessaries; *Of Assent*, I say, to it, because infallible. 3ly. That, all are to acquiesce, none presume to urge, or credit any pretence of Scripture, or Demonstration against such a judgment; because, *infallible.* 4ly. That, it is Schism to depart from the judgment of such a *Council*; because the Archbishop holds, all departure of any Member from the *whole Church* Catholick, to be so‖.

‖ §. 26. p. 165.

‖ §. 21. p. 139.

§. 38.

Reply, Where.

Concerning what acceptation of Councils by the Church diffusive is only necessary.

Now, thus much being professed by the Archbishop; if he will also allow the Church, or her Councils, and not private men, to judge what Definitions are made in matters *necessary*; and, 2ly. will grant an acceptation of such Council by a *much major part* of the Church Catholick diffusive (I mean, of those Church-Governours in it, whose judgments can be had) to be sufficient, though some lesser party continue to contradict, I think several Controversies, that are yet agitated, will appear formerly decided, and the Church's Peace not so difficult to be setled. For in the Church Catholick, within this last thousand years, have been assembled many Councils so General as the times permitted, and as the Callers thereof could procure; and these her Councils have made

made many *Definitions* contrary to the Proteſtant Doctrines; and yet ſhe hath not hitherto, (though importuned by ſeveral pretending *Demonſtrators* of the contrary to theſe Definitions,) aſſembled her ſelf in any other Synod equal to the former, to recall ſuch Councils, or their acts, (ſuch a *tacit* admiſſion being all that the Archbiſhop requires ||) Nay, when *later* Councils have been called from time to time, yet in theſe ſhe hath altered nothing concerning thoſe Definitions in the *former*: Nay, a much major part at leaſt of the Church Catholick have alſo, out of Councils, in their publick VVritings, Doctrines, and Practiſes, not only not contradicted, but owned the Legality of theſe Councils, and the truth of their Decrees: Now, may we not hence conclude, that the whole Church Catholick (I mean, whoſe judgment we can procure) hath, in ſuch a ſence as is neceſſary, admitted, and accepted them? And that nothing hath been, or is brought in, that ſhe takes for a demonſtration to the contrary to what ſhe hath defined? And here may we not conclude, that, according to the Archbiſhop's ſence, theſe fore-paſt, and ſo long unqueſtioned, Councils are to be eſteemed *infallible*? Or, if this we may not preſume; what hopes have we left, of ever knowing the Church Catholick's mind; her acceptation, or non-acceptation of any thing! or of enjoying at all, as to *Neceſſaries*, this her infallible Guidance, promiſed us by Proteſtants, in ſtead of that of her Council's. VVe have waited now above 400 years, ſince the Conciliar determination of *Tranſubſtantiation*: no Council *equal* to thoſe, which paſſed it, hath been aſſembled by the Church Catholick to retract it: I ask, Hath not the Church then already ſufficiently *accepted* it, though ſome, in ſome times, have offered to her their ſeemiug demonſtrations againſt it? In the expectation of *new demonſtrations*; of a *new Aſſembly*; ſuch as ſhall be called by the whole Church Catholick, and not by the *Pope*; and of a Council more *full*, and compleat, than any former for a thouſand years, have been; wherein the *Cophtites*, *Melabites*, *Armenians*, *Abyſſines*, *Ruſſians*, &c, are to have a part; I ask, what ſhall poor Chriſtians do for a Guide, that may ſecure them, at leaſt in *Fundamentals*, If firſt, The moſt ſupream Guides that they have, and have had, and ſuch acceptation of their Acts, as hath been, may not be *ſecurely* relied on; and (then,) ſuch an infallible Guide, as is promiſed them inſtead thereof, can never be had? Unleſs theſe Divines alſo will here retreat, and make uſe of the Anſwer that is mentioned before, §. 8. *viz.* that nothing at all, that is, or can, come into controverſie, is neceſſary to be decided.

|| See before, §. 327.

§. 39.

But, If the *paſt Councils* need an acceptation of

of the whole Catholick Church to render them infallible, more than the acceptation that is fore-mentioned, what must it be? 1st. Must it be that of *another Council* assembled by the Church? For such thing the Archbishop mentions. But, how shall we know, again, of this Council, whether the Church Catholick *sufficiently* accepts it? And what if it accepts this no more amply than the former? Or, are there any such new Evidences or Demonstrations now discoverable in matter of Faith, that are not as liable to be *mistaken* in *one* Council, as in *another*; in a later, as in a former? If you say, *Yes*; *Because a Demonstration* (in the Archbishop's sence ||) *is such, as being proposed to* any man, *and understood, the mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent unto it*: I answer; Such a Definition suits not with Theological, but Mathematical Demonstrations, such as this, that twice two makes four; for what, or how few Theological Truths are they, that all, in their right wits, and understanding the Terms, immediatly assent to, when proposed? Or what Judge, in these matters, can promise such Evidence, as that none, having the use of Reason, shall deny his Sentence? Lastly, As to one Council's accepting of another, where can we stay, if we may not in the first? For will not this second Council be rendred as uncertain to us for it's Definitions, and as liable to Appeals, upon other new *Evidences*, and *Demonstrations* pretended against it, as the former was? For when, in it's Definition, against these *false* ones that are already examined, it corroborates the former; yet this hinders not, but that some *other* Evidences may be produced against it, and against the same Definition, that may be *true*. Or, 2ly. Must it be such an acceptation of the whole Catholick Church *out of Council*; that no person, or at least, Church, contradicts such former Council? This also is unreasonable: For some, not only Persons, but Churches, and these very considerable, (I mean, in comparison of some other Churches, though not in respect of the main Body of the Catholick Profession) may stand condemned of Heresie, and Schism by some former Council; and therefore do become uncapable of any right now, either of *Voting* in, or *accepting* of, a future Council; I mean, in such a manner, as that their Vote, and acceptation, are any way necessary to the validity thereof. Or such Persons, or Churches, if not condemned of *former* Heresie, yet may be, by the much greater, and more considerable part of the present Council, for some *new* Doctrine of theirs, against the former *traditive* Faith of the Church, either suspended from sitting, and voting with them; or admitted to vote (as in a thing perhaps not so clear

in

in former *tradition*), yet when they are, in the number of Suffrages, much inferior, in this case neither their contrary Vote in the Council, nor their non-acceptation of it afterward, are of any effect, as to the annulling of the Acts of such Councils. Otherwise no *new* Tenent can be condemned by the Church; if those who hold it, being a *considerable* number, will not concur, to vote, or to accept, the condemnation thereof. Some *Arrian* Bishops never accepted the *Council* of *Nice*; nor now the *Socinians*. Unless therefore the former acceptation of the Church Catholick, though perhaps deficient in some persons, or also Churches, may suffice to render, or declare the judgment of that Council infallible, who can be assured, but that this *Nicen* Council erred in a point Fundamental, (if the Deity of our Saviour may be thought such)? The Church Catholick's *acknowledged Infallibility* in Fundamentals, and her *acceptation* of Councils, may not be obstructed with such unactuable Circumstances, as that these can never, in any particular, come to be known. This for the Archbishop.

§. 40. Of Dr. *Field*. ‖ l. 4. c. 2.

Again, thus Dr. *Field* ‖ concerning the present Catholick Church in any one Age——*As we hold it impossible the Church should ever by Apostacy, and miss-belief wholly depart from God, (in proving whereof,* Bellarmine *confesseth, his Fellows have taken much needless pains, seeing no man of our profession thinketh any such thing.* [*Bellarmin*'s words are, *Notandum, multos ex nostris tempus terere, dum probant absolutè Ecclesiam non posse deficere. Nam* Calvinus, *& cæteri Hæretici id concedunt; sed dicunt intelligi debere, de Ecclesiâ invisibili:*] *So we hold, that, it never falleth into any Heresie: So that he is as much to be blamed for idle, and needless busying himself in proving, that the visible Church never falleth into Heresie, which we most willingly grant.* [*Bellarmin*'s words are,——*Probare igitur volumus, Ecclesiam visibilem non posse deficere; & nomine Ecclesiæ non intelligimus unum, aut alterum hominem Christianum, sed multitudinem congregatam, in quâ sunt Prælati, & Subditi,* [urging also afterward, out of *Eph.* 4. 11. the Ministries of *Pastors*, *Doctors*, &c. never to fail in the Church:] *quæ Ministeria (saith he) non possunt exerceri; nisi se* Pastores, *&* Oves *agnoscant.* From all which, I collect, that, of such a visible Church-Government, consisting of *Prelates*, and *Subjects*, it must be, that Dr. *Field* affirms, (*Ibid.*) ——*That in things necessary to be known, and believed, expresly, and distinctly, it can never be ignorant, much less err; nor never fall into any Heresie.*] ——As also afterward, (*c.* 4.) *In all Ages he*

acknowledgeth a Church, that not as a Cheſt *preſerves only the Truth, as a hidden Treaſure; but as a* Pillar, *by publick Profeſſion (notwithſtanding all Forces endeavouring to ſhake it) publiſheth it to the world, and ſtayeth the weakneſs of others*, &c.

CHAP. VI.

IV. *Learned Proteſtants conceding, the former Church's Clergy preceding the Reformation never ſo to have erred in defining Neceſſaries, as that the Church governed by them did not remain ſtill True, Holy, and Catholick.* §. 41.

§. 41.

IV. 4. Learned Proteſtants conceding the former Churches Clergy preceding the Reformation never to have ſo erred in defining Neceſſaries, as that the Church governed by them, did not ſtill remain True, Holy, Catholick.

IV. SUitably to their *Conceſſions* ſet down in the laſt Chapter; theſe Learned *Proteſtants* do not aſſume the confidence to pronounce; The *joint Body* of the Governors of any precedent Age of the Church, how corrupt ſoever they have been in their *Conciliary Definitions*, to have erred, or to have miſled the people, in *Neceſſaries*, *Eſſentials*, or *Fundamentals* of Religion, whether in reſpect of Faith or Holineſs, (notwithſtanding that they have placed, in theſe very times, the Reign of *Antichriſt*. Whence it may be preſumed; that the Church ſhall not ſee, nor ſuffer, hereafter worſe times, than thoſe paſt: And that all theſe Governors, in any ſucceeding Age, ſhall not miſs-guide the people in *Neceſſaries*, or Fundamentals, whom, in the times of *Antichriſt*, they have not miſled ſo.) Therefore Biſhop *Bramhall* || holds the preſent *Roman*, a true part of the preſent Church Catholick; and frequently affirms the Reformed, as to *Eſſentials* in *Faith*, not to have ſeparated from it. And Dr. *Potter* ſpeaks thus of the preſent *Roman* Church ||——*The moſt neceſſary, and Fundamental Truths which conſtitute a Church, are on both ſides unqueſtioned; and, for that reaſon, learned Proteſtants yield them* [the *Roman*] *the Name, and Subſtance of a true Church.* Dr. *Field* alſo || thus apologizeth for this Tenent, at leaſt for the times before *Luther*.—*Becauſe ſome men perhaps will think, that we yield more unto our Adverſaries now, than formerly we did; in that we acknowledge the* Latine, *or Weſtern Churches, ſubject to* Romiſh *Tyranny, before God raiſed up* Luther, *to have been the true Churches*

|| Vindic. 2 c. p. 8.---Reply to *Chalcedon*, p. 345.

|| §. 3. p. 63.

|| Def. 3. pt p. 880.

ches of God, *in which a saving Profession of the Truth of Christ was found*——*I will* 1st. *shew, that all our best and most renowned Divines did ever acknowledge as much as I have written.* And so he proceeds to urge several Authorities to confirm it.

§. 42. And thus Mr. *Thorndike* || saith—*Though I sincerely blame the imposing new Articles upon the Faith of Christians; and that of Positions, which I maintain not to be true; yet I must, and do freely profess, that I find no position necessary to salvation prohibited, none destructive to salvation enjoined to be believed, by it* [the *Roman* Church:] *And therefore I must necessarily accept it for a true Church, as in the Church of* England *I have always known it accepted; seeing there can no question be made, that it continueth the same visible Body, by the succession of Pastors, and Laws, that first were founded by the Apostles (the present Customes* [that are] *in force, being visibly the corruptions of those Customs, which the Church had from the beginning* [I suppose he means, being the same Customs which the Church had from the beginning, though in some manner corrupted.]) *For the Idolatries, which I grant to be possible, (though not necessary) to be found in it, by the Ignorance, and carnal Affections of Particulars, (not by command of the Church, or the Laws of it) I do not admit to destroy the salvation of those, who, living in the Communion of this Church, are not guilty of the like. There remaines therefore in the present Church of* Rome *the Profession of all the Truth, which it is necessary to the Salvation of all Christians to believe, either in point of Faith, or Manners.*——So he saith concerning Prayer to Saints——*That those, who admit the Church of* Rome *to commit Idolatry therein, can by no means grant it to be a Church; the very being whereof supposeth the Worship of one God exclusive to any thing else.* And *l.* 3. *c.* 23, Concerning Communion in one kind, he saith,——*That they in the Church of* Rome, *who thirst after the Eucharist in both kinds, do receive the whole Grace of this Sacrament in the one kind, is necessary to be believed by all, who believe that the Church of* Rome *remains a Church though corrupt, and that Salvation is to be had in it, and by it.*

|| Epilog. Conclusion, p. 416.

§. 43. 2. Again; For the *Essentials*, or Necessary Doctrines in order to *Holiness*, these learned Protestants grant, that *Holy* is an Attribute unseparable from *Catholick* [*Credo, Sanctam, Catholicam Ecclesiam*;] And that the Church cannot be the one, unless it be the other; and as in the whole, so in the parts; that no particular Church is a part of the Catholick, that hath not the *Holiness* of the Catholick ——Of which thus the

‖ p. 142. Archbishop ‖.——*If we will keep our Faith, the whole Militant Church must be still* Holy. *For if it be not so still, then there may be a time, that a falshood may be the Subject of the Catholick Faith; which were no less than Blasphemy to affirm: For we must still believe* the Holy Catholick Church. *And if she be not still* Holy, *then, at the time that she is not so, we believe a falshood under the Article of the Christian Faith.* Of this more needs not be said.

§. 44. 3. Again, If, under such Governors, the visible Church, preceding the Reformation, is allowed to have been *Catholick*, and *Holy*; from these it must needs be granted also not to have been *Heretical*, or *Schismatical*. Which Churches Protestants contra-distinguish to the *Catholick* Church, and all the Members of it; and in which Churches, dividing from the *Unity* of the Catholick, no salvation can be had by those, who, if either knowing, or culpably ignorant of, these sins of such a Church, do not actually desert such a Communion. For this likewise, see the Quotations out of the Archbishop, before §. 367. and out of Dr. *Field*, before, §. 40.——*Bellarmine* (saith he) *is to be blamed for idle, and needless busying himself in proving that the visible Church never falleth into* Heresie, *which we most willingly grant.* ——And (*l.* 1. *c.* 7.) he saith,——*That, the name of Catholick Church distinguisheth men holding the Faith* in Unity *from* Schismaticks; *whom as also* Hereticks, though he there affirms—*to be, in some sort, of the Church* [taken more generally] *as it distinguisheth men of the Christian Profession from Infidels, yet not of the Church Catholick, or fully and perfectly of the Church,* with hope of Salvation ‖. The Common Prayers also, used both in the *Roman* and *Protestant* Churches on Good *Friday*, shew the same.——*Oremus* (saith the one) *pro Hæreticis, & Schismaticis; ut Deus eos ad Sanctam Matrem Ecclesiam Catholicam, atq; Apostolicam revocare dignetur.*——*Have Mercy Lord* (saith the other) *upon all* Jews, Turks, Infidels, *and* Hereticks, *and so fetch them home to thy Flock*——*that they may be saved among the remnant of the true* Israelites, *and be made one Fold under one Shepherd.* But, in the trans-ferring these Good-*Friday* Collects out of the former Missal into their new Common-Prayer-Book, 'tis observable, that though the Reformed retained *Hereticks*, yet they omitted *Schismaticks*; and 2ly. changed the former Expression of *revoca ad Sanctam Matrem Ecclesiam Catholicam, & Apostolicam*, into *Fetch home to thy Flock*, &c. As if the mention of our Holy Mother, the Catholick, Apostolick Church, might occasion in the people

‖ l. 1. c. 14. p. 21 —— & c. 7. p. 13.

people some Mistakes. See also Bishop *Bramhal*'s Vindication of the Church of *England*, c. 2. p. 9, 27, 28; & before, §. 34.

And thus Mr. *Thorndike* in his Letter concerning the present state of Religion‖——'*When we say*, we believe the Catholick Church, *as part of that faith whereby we hope to be saved*; *we do not profess to believe, that there is such a company of men* [professing Christianity], *but that there is a Corporation of true Christians, excluding* Hereticks *and* Schismaticks; *and that we hope to be saved by this faith, as being members of it* [of that Corporation]. *And this is that, which the stile of the* Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church *signifies*; *as distinguishing the Body of true Christians, (to wit, so far as Profession goes) from the Conventicles of Hereticks and Schismaticks. For this title of* Catholick *would signifie nothing, if* Hereticks *and* Schismaticks *were not barred the Communion of the Church.* Thus he. ‖ 208.

§. 45. [' In the former passages you may observe, that the Authors fore-quoted speak not of *some, or other* in the Church, before *Luther*, to have bin *Catholick*, and consequently *holy*, *&c.* but of the visible Church, consisting of the ruling *Clergy*, and the subject and conforming *Laity*, according to the publick doctrines, and Definitions thereof, as these being not deficient in the Essentials of the Church Catholick, either as to *Faith* or *Holiness*: for such a *Church Catholick* they believe always to be, whose doctrine and definitions, discipline and external visible profession, maintained by the Governors thereof, is *Catholick*. And if, in any other sense, we call it a *Catholick Church*, (when we hold its Governours and Doctrines, mean-while, *Heretical* and *Schismatical*) *viz.* by reason of *some*, that may be found herein Catholickly perswaded, we may as well call that an heretical Church, the Doctrines and Doctors of which are Catholick, if perhaps *some* only in it be heretically affected.] To go on.

§ 46. Therefore Dr. *Field* proceeds also so far, as to own the Western Church, that was before *Luther*, for the Protestants true *Mother* (for indeed where could he find, at that time, a Church any whit better, to call Mother) and to confesse‖: '*That she continued* the true Church of God *until our time*——*And*——*To those* (saith he) *that demand of us, where our Church was before* Luther *began: We answer, it was the* known, *and* apparent *Church in the world, wherein all our Fathers lived, and died*; *wherein* Luther *and the rest were baptized, &c*; *and* ‖ *wherein a saving profession of the truth in Christ was found.* In order to which he so far justifies the *publick service* also of those dayes, which our Fathers frequented, ‖ l. 3. c. 6. ‖ 3 Part p. 880.

even

|| Append.3 l. p.224. even the *Canon* of the *Maſs* it ſelf; as to ſay, || —— "*That the uſing therof*, [& no other was uſed in thoſe days, than is now], *is no proof, that the Church, that then was, was not a* Proteſtant *Church, and that both the Liturgie it ſelf, and the profeſſion of ſuch as uſed it, ſhew plainly, that the Church that then was, never allowed any* Romiſh *errour*. And again, ſo far juſtifies he the doctrine of that Church, which he owns as *Catholick*, and the Proteſtants-*Mother*, as to affirm ||: *That none of thoſe points of falſe doctrine and errour, which the Roman Church now maintaineth, and the Proteſtants condemn, were the doctrines of that Church* [before Luther] *conſtantly delivered* [He muſt mean *conſtantly*, for the preſent Age before *Luther*, for in that Age he acknowledgeth it Catholick] or generally received by all them that were of it, but *doubtfully* broached and deviſed without all certain reſolution, or *factiouſly* defended by ſome certain only, &c. [It ſeems therefore, that look how many Doctrines (of thoſe now condemned by Proteſtants,) may appear to have bin in the Church, (I ſay not here, the Catholick, but the Latin Church, for of this he ſpeaks) before *Luther*, not doubtfully broached, but in her Councils reſolved, in her publick Liturgies conformed to, and generally received, (*Generally*, not as including every ſingle perſon, for ſo perhaps were not the doctrine of the *Trinity*, or of Chriſts *Incarnation*, received; but ſo generally received by the then Weſtern Church-Governors, as is neceſſary for the ratification of the Decrees of their *Repreſentatives* met in Councils, for more than this cannot, rationally, be required) ſo many he will acknowledge for Catholick, and, in obedience thereto, ſhew a filial Duty to this his *Mother*.]

|| p.880.

§. 47. n. 1.

|| Apol. 3 par. p.880. & Append. 3 l.p. 187,224.

And therefore, after this, to defend the diſceſſion of the Reformed from, and their preſent non-communion with, the preſent Weſtern Church, he ſeeks to relieve himſelf, in ſaying, || *That this Roman Church is not the ſame now, as it was when* Luther *began*.——*Nor the external face of Religion then, the now profeſſed Roman Religion*.——And further, || *That the errors of the preſent Roman Church are* Fundamental.

Where it is obſervable, 1ſt. That the *diſceſſion* of Proteſtants in *Luthers* time, or of *Luther* himſelf, from that Church, (which was not the ſame, as he ſaith, then, as now, nor the Errors which Proteſtants now condemn, then the doctrines of it, but of a faction in it) remains by this ſtill *culpable*; For none may deſert the *Communion* of a *Church*, becauſe of the corrupt doctrines or practices of a faction in it. But if he make the Clergy, and Eccleſiaſtical Governours of ſuch Church, impoſing ſuch doctrines, and requiring unjuſt conditions of their Communion to be that Faction, then

the *Doctrins*, and the *Faction*, to be charged on the very *Church* it self, and not on a *party* in it; (as a Church, all the ruling Clergy of which holds and imposeth Arrianism, is rightly stiled an Arrian Church, if any can be so.) But this expression, Dr. *Field* saw, he had reason to forbear.

§. 47. n. 2.

['And therefore Bishop *Bramhall* || thought fit 'to take another course; and, for the defence of the *lawfulness* of this first discession of Protestants, (which dis- 'cession, the Bishop of *Chalcedon* urged, to have preceded 'those grievances, and impediments of Communion, that Prote- 'stants of later times chiefly complain of; namely, the *many new* 'Definitions and *Anathema*'s of the Council of *Trent*, and *new Ar- 'ticles and Creeds* of *Pius* the fourth) seems to make a contrary 'plea to Dr. Field —— *For those very points* (saith he) *which* Pius *the* 'fourth *comprehended in a new Symbol or Creed, were* obtruded 'upon *us before by his Predecessors*, [and therefore before the 'ratification, or *obliging* authority of the Council of *Trent*] *as ne- 'cessary Articles of the Roman Faith, and* required, *as necessary* 'Articles *of their Communion; so, as we must either receive* 'these, *or utterly lose them. This is the only difference, that* 'Pius *the fourth dealt in gross, his Predecessors by retail. They* 'fashioned *the several rods, and he bound them up into a bundle.* '[But if the Bishop understands this of the *Council of Trent*, that 'sate under the Predecessors of *Pius*, the Query still remains con- 'cerning the lawful Grounds of the *first* Protestant-*discession*, from 'the former Church, which discession precedes the beginning of 'that Council, above *twenty* years,]

|| Reply to Chalced. p. 263.

§. 47. n. 3.

2ly. It is observable, that the discession made since, from the *former publick service* of the Church, and the *Canon* of the *Masse*, (affirmed by Dr. *Field* to contain in it no Romish Errors) must be also culpable; in which nothing, since *Luthers* time, hath been altered.

3ly That the present Church of *Rome* in being said by him, since that time, to *err* in *Fundamentals*, is hereby ceased to be any *part* of the Church-*Catholick*; and (further) no salvation to be had in her at all, even to the invincibly ignorant; if Dr. *Field* holds, no truth to be fundamental to salvation, but such, without which salvation cannot possibly be had; Concerning which see what he saith 3 *l.* 4 *c. p.* 79.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

V. *That, according to the former Concession made in the precedent Chapter, §. 41. there seems to be * a great security to those continuing in the ancient Communion.* §. 48. *As to avoiding Heresie, or Schism,* Ib. *As, to other grosser Errors.* §. 51. *And * danger to those deserting it.* §. 54. *Where is drawn up in brief, the Protestant's Defence for such Discession.* §. 55. n. 1. *And the Catholick's Remonstrance.* §. 55. n. 9.

V.

§. 48. The security that hence seems to be to those continuing in the ancient Communion.

NOw to reflect on the former Discourse, as to the two *Principal Concessions*, made by Protestants therein. The 1st. Their conceding the *Catholickness*, and Indeficiency of the former Western Church, as to all *Necessaries*, before, and at, the coming of *Luther* ||. The 2d. Their conceding the general Councils of the Church in any age to be unerrable in *Necessaries*, when they are *universally* accepted by the Church Catholick diffusive.||

|| §. 41, &c.
|| §. 32, &c.

From the first of these, (the Catholickness of the *Roman* Church before *Luther* in Necessaries), being granted, methinks appears a great security for their salvation, (as to their *Faith*, who are not deficient in a holy life) to all those who persevere to live, and die in the external Communion of the present *Roman*, and other Western Churches, unreformed; (and then, the like hazard to those, who relinquish that Communion.)

As to Heresie or Schism.

For, 1st. I think it is clear; that none who lived, and died in the *Faith* (I mean; that, declared in her Councils) and in the *Communion* of the Western, or *Roman* Church, that was before *Luther's* Appearance, could endanger his Salvation, upon the account of his incurring either *Heresie*, or *Schism*; because then the Western, or *Roman* Church before *Luther*, must be held Heretical, or Schismatical, and so non-Catholick; for these two Heretical, and Catholick, are contra-distinct. (See the Archbishop, §. 21. n. 5. p. 141. and what is said before, §. 44.) And then, seeing there was an *Holy Catholick Church*, some where or other, in that immediately before *Luther*, as in every Age; *which*, and

where

Where was it? The *Eastern* Churches using much-what the same publick Liturgy; and being guilty of as gross Errors and Practises; and also they, excluding Non-Conformists from their Communion.

§. 49.

Add to this Mr. *Stillingfleet's* Position ‖ ——*That, if we enquire; what was positively believed as necessary to Salvation by the Catholick Church: we shall hardly find any better way than by the Articles of the ancient Creeds; and the universal opposition of any new Doctrine on its first appearing; and the condemning the Broachers of it for Heresie, in Oecumenical Councils; With the continual disapprobation of those Doctrines by the Christian Churches of all Ages. As is clear in the Cases of* Arrius, *and* Pelagius. *For it seems very reasonable* (saith he) *to judge; that, since the necessary Articles of Faith were all delivered by the Apostles to the Catholick Church, since the foundation of that Church lies in the belief of those things which are necessary; that nothing should be delivered contrary to any necessary Article of Faith, but the Church, by some* evident Act, *must declare its dislike of it, and its resolution thereby to adhere to that necessary Doctrine which was once delivered to the Saints.* Thus he. From which thought so reasonable, is gathered the security in adhering to those Tenents, received in the Church before *Luther* (which Protestants now oppose) as being not *contrary to any necessary Article of Faith, delivered by the Apostles to the Catholick Church,* because Protestants cannot shew (to repeat here the former words) *the Broachers of these Tenents,* [suppose of a Substantial Conversion in the Eucharist; Saint-Invocation; Veneration of Images; a Purgatory of Souls after this life; Monastick Vows; Sacrifice of the Mass, *&c.*] *condemned for Heresie in Oecumenical Councils; or a continual disapprobation of those Doctrines by the Christian Churches of all ages* (*as is clear in the cases of* Arrius, *and* Pelagius;) *or, the Church by any* evident Act, *declaring her dislike of them*; as may, on the other side, be shewed many *evident Acts* of her Approbation of them.

‖ Rat. account p. 58.

§§. 50. n. 1.

And 2ly. If no danger of perishing for Heresie, or Schisme, to those living, and dying in this Communion *before*, then neither to any *since*, *Luther's* times. For if, since these times, this Communion be become Heretical, or Schismatical, I demand, in respect of what *Council*, or what *Definitions*, made since *Luther's* days, which it opposeth, is it becom Heretical? or in respect of what *Church*, in deserting, or departing from its Communion, Schismatical? Or in the Protestant's Noti-

ons of Herese, and Schism; in respect of what *new* Tenent, or Practise against some Fundamental point of Faith, since *Luther's* time, is it become *Heretical*; when guilty of none such, before? ——And, in its *requiring* of *Conformity* to what *new* points of Faith, since *Luther's* time, is it become *Schismatical*; so that one, that could lawfully yield obedience to all those required before *Luther's* appearance, yet cannot to all the present; or so, that the Church before *Luther* might lawfully require, without hazard of Schism, Conformity to its whole Faith then; and not so the *present* Church to the whole, *present*, Faith? For I hope none here will have the face to deny Conformity required, by the Western Churches, before *Luther's* coming, to many of the chiefest of those points, wherein Protestants now refuse it. See those, mentioned, *Disc.*3. §. 26.

§. 50.n.2. And you may observe, that the *most*, or *chiefest* of the Protestant Controversies, defined, or made *de fide*, in the Council of *Trent*, were made so By former Councils of equal obligation; or also were contained in the *publick Liturgies* of the Church Catholick. As; The *Lawfulness* of *Communion* in *one kind*, declared in the Council of *Constance*. *Canon of Scripture*; *Purgatory*; *seven Sacraments*; *the Pope's Supremacy*; in the Council of *Florence*. *Auricular Confession*; *Transubstantiation*; in the Council of *Florence*, the *Lateran*, and *five others* before it, wherein *Berengarius* his Doctrines were condemned. *Veneration of Images*, in the 2d *Nicene* Council. *Monastick Vows*; and *Celibacy of the Clergy*; sufficiently authorized in the *four first General Councils*. And, to these, I may add the Council of *Frankfort*, (if the *Capitulare Caroli*, which indeed was written before, may be taken to deliver the sence of the Council.) * For *Adoration of Christ's Body and Blood* in the *Eucharist*: the Council applying the Psalmist's *Adorate Scabellum* thereto, as it is expounded by S. *Ambrose* * , and S. *Austin* : || And for *Veneration of the Cross* ||, and *of Relicks* ||. [Only the *Adoration of Images*, allowed by the second *Nicene* Council, indeed is condemned: but this upon a Mistake of the Doctrine of that Council; as is confessed, by Dr. *Hammond*, *Treatise of Idolatry*, §. 57. And by Mr *Thorndike*, Epil. *l.* 3. *p.* 363. And as any one may easily discern, if he will view in the Preface of this *Capitulare*, what opinion was imputed by the *Fathers* of *Franckfort* to those of *Nice*. Besides these Councils; *Invocation of Saints*; *Prayers for the Dead*, *Sacrifice of the Masse* and several other, are apparent in the *Publick Liturgies* of the Church, unaltered, (Protestants

|| *De Spiritu Sancto*, l. 3. c. 12.
|| *Capitulare* l. 2. c. 5.-c. 27. -l. 4. c. 17
* *Ibid* 4. 15. l. 3. c. 24

testants being Judges) for many ages preceding the Council of *Trent*; Now the Church obligeth her Subjects to *believe* all those things *lawful*, which, in her Liturgies, she obligeth them to *practice*.* And, why was there made a departure from the Church for these points, before the Council of *Trent*, if the Church, before, had not made them *de fide*; or required Obedience and Conformity to them; or if the Council of *Trent*, or *Pius* the Fourth were first faulty herein ‖? Suppose then, a belief of some more Points is since added; yet I ask, will the decreeing, or imposing of these infer upon the *present* Church the guilt of Schism; and not the like decreeing, or imposing the former, infer the same guilt upon the former Church, that preceding *Luther*? Now from this *Identity* in Faith. and practice, in the present Church, with that preceding *Luther*, (excepting, if our Gratitude may be allowed to speak the truth, that the Council, held since *Luther*'s time, hath reformed several practises, in some persons of it, which were before justly blamed) it seems clear, that whoso is a member of the present Western, or *Roman* Church, is secure, that he is a Member of the Church Catholick: For it is impossible, that the Church, which is the same with what was the Church Catholick 150 years ago, should, meerly by the difference, and decurrence of time, become non-Catholick. Now if this be denied, that the present *Roman* Church is the same for it's Doctrines, and Practices, with that Church, which was at *Luther*'s appearing, let the issue of the Contention be placed here; and let search only be made concerning this. Not to ask, mean-while, why *Luther* reformed, then; why exclaimed, so vehemently on the *Babylonish* Captivity; and sounded an *Exite de illâ Populus meus*, if the *Deformation* of this Church, it's *non-holinesse*, it's *non-Catholickness*, is since the Council of *Trent*; and so not till after his time?

* p. addend. p. 364.

‖ See Bishop *Bramhal*'s Concession, before, §. 47.

3ly. As (I think) here is shewed no danger of perishing in the present external Communion of these Churches upon the account of *Heresie*, or *Schism*; so neither is there, on the account of any *grosse*, or *grievous Errors*. For, 1st. How are they *grievous* Errors, that are not against any *necessary* Point of Faith? But if they be; such, with Protestants, are *Heresies*. For Example, to name some chief ones. How are Adoration of the Eucharist, or Invocation of Saints *grievous Errors*, if also they be not against any necessary point of Faith: *viz.* this, That *Divine Worship*, and *Divine Supplication* (which they say is presented to *Saints*) may be given only to *God*? But

‖ §. 51. As to other gross Errors.

then they are *Heresies*. Or what so grievous Error in the present Communion, that was not, (it, or as bad,) in the same Communion before *Luther*'s time? When, yet, Christians, in this Communion, were secure; because, it was then the Catholick; and the Catholick, being always *Holy*, may err indeed in *superstructions* and deductions, and other *by*, and *unnecessary* Truths from *curiosity*, *&c.* but cannot err from the *Foundation* (saith the Archbishop) I add, as, of Faith, so also, of Good Manners. These Errors then, which are now charged to render the Church of *Rome* guilty of a manifold Idolatry, in her worshipping the *Eucharistical Bread*; the *Relicks* and *Images* of Saints; and making Prayers to *them*, were they not the *same* in the Church before *Luther*, and the *same* their effect? Or if the same Errors, then, light, are now become grievous: Upon what account? Is it, upon a more *evident Conviction* Christians may have now, than heretofore, that such are Errors? But what ground can we have to say, that they now, *culpably*, and *convincibly*, err in these, who, no more than those before *Luther*, can be accused for holding any Errors, save such, as are the *Publick Faith* of the Church, now authorized as much, as that before *Luther*; and who, to preserve themselves from erring, make use of the securest way, that Reason can imagine, or that Christians are prescribed; whilst, for the sence of the Scriptures, *controverted* in such Points, they chuse not to rely on their own judgment, but on that of the *supremest Guides* of the Church, and *Judges* of divine Truth, that are afforded them here on earth; and so, if they err, yet take the wisest course to miss erring, that Religion, or Reason can dictate? To which *Guides* also all the Subjects of this *former Communion* believe submission of their private judgment to be due, and to be commanded; (which is a very plausible one, if, an Error). From whence also it follows, that till they are convinced of Error in this one Point, of *Submission* not to be due, they are not capable of being convinced in any other, where it is required: Nay yet further; to the *Obedience* of which *Guides*, at least for *silence*, and *non-contradiction*, they are obliged, even by the Doctrine of Learned Protestants ||, where-ever they *cannot demonstrate* the contrary: which demonstration is a degree of Conviction, surely, very few can pretend to,

§. 21. p. 141.

|| See *Disc.* 3. § 44.

§. 52.

1. It is said indeed by Protestants ||, That, all Particular Churches, or the whole Catholick Church, in some age, or ages, may *universally hold* some Tenent, that is an *Error*; but then, granted by them: That, any such *universally held* Error can never destroy the *Essence*, or *Being* of the Church Catholick,

|| *Stillingf.* p. 330. Archbishop *Laud*, § 21. n. 5.

or

or render it non Catholick; because, thus, in such age the Church Catholick would fail. Now from this I collect my security, (ni holding any Tenents, though they should happen to be Errors, which were universally held in the Church before *Luther*), that, as they destroy not the Church it's *being* still *Catholick*, so neither do they expell me from still continuing in the bosom of the *Church Catholick*. And hence, for example, I am secured; that I am *no Idolater*, if not swerving from the Church's Doctrines; because the Church, whilst Catholick, (as she is affirmed to be) is not such. But in joining with a Church, that, pretending to reform, holds the contradictories of these former universal Tenents, I am not here secure, but that some of these Tenents may be such Errors, as exclude this new Church from being a part of the Catholick; and me, if adhering to it, from being a Member thereof; as the maintaining, by the *Arrians*, and others, of some Tenents contrary to the universal Doctrines of the former Church, hath separated them from the Church Catholick: I say, for any *Tenent*, I can shew to have been *spread over* the *whole* Catholick Church at *Luther*'s appearance, I am secured by Protestants, that in holding this, I am free from *Heresie*, or being rendred thereby extra-Catholick: But then, I am not so, in my entring into a new Society, that contradicts this *Church*, and such *Tenents*; except, in such Points, of the truth of which I am infallibly certain.

§. 52.

2. Again, it is affirmed by Protestants ||: That a *Separation* may be made, without *Schism*, from the external communion of all particular Churches [some of which, or all which, I say, must be the *Catholick*] of some age, for some Points, if held, and imposed by them: *viz.* Those Points, wherein the Essence, and Union of the Church Catholick consisteth not, because in such the Church Catholick may err; but cannot, without *Schism*, for other Points: *viz.* such, as constitute the necessary Faith of the Church Catholick, wherein she erreth not; for so she would cease to be Catholick. Now from hence also I gather: that I, continuing in the external communion of all those particular Churches, can never be non-Catholick, or guilty in concurring in any *Schism*, for my holding, and conforming to, any of the Church's *universal* Tenents, because none such can destroy the Church from being Catholick still ||. But, in my separation from all these Churches, imposing such Tenents, I am not secure; because some of these Tenents (as Protestants grant) may possibly be such, as are some part of the necessary Catholick Faith; and so my separation, if made on such account, is Schism.

See *Stillingf* p. 331. *Chillingw.* c. 5. §. 52, 55, 56, 59.

This

§. 54. And danger to those deserting it.

This security then they seem to enjoy, who live, and die in the Communion of the unreformed, Western, or Roman, Church, before, or since *Luthers* times; they being acquitted thereby from *Heresie*, and *Schism*, or any other error damnative to them, who therein follow their spiritual Guides, not against Conscience. But the like, I see not, how any may promise to himself in living, and dying in a *new-raised* Communion, and in deserting the former; especially if deserting it for any former *general* doctrines, and practises thereof; which, if *not enjoin'd*, he, here left to his free liberty, hath no reason, for these, to withdraw himself from the Communion of the *whole*; but if *enjoyned*, ought in these to submit to the judgment of the *whole*: especially so many, as cannot *demonstrate* against it; || to submit, at least so far, as if not to *assent*, yet not to *contradict*. All which are transgressed in following the Reformation; where such a person, for the sence of the Scriptures controverted, and for his denying conformity to the doctrines delivered by the Church as matter of Faith, either relies on his *own* judgment: or, in submitting to a Guide, follows *inferior*, against Superior, Governors, or Synods; or a *Minor*, against a much major part; Lastly, follows those, who have refused conformity to the external Communion, even to the Liturgies and *publick service*, of the whole former Catholick Church, whether *Eastern* or *Western*, and have set up a new one against them of their own, which are all manifest breaches of the unity of the whole: I say, I see no *security* any can have in such a new Communion; excepting that, which *invincible ignorance* affords; which, in such an apparent decession from former Churches and Councils, God knows how few, especially of the Learned, that peruse the Writings of former times, it may shelter.

|| See 2 Disc. §. 20.

§. 55. n. 1. Where. A brief Relation of the Protestants defence.

The most moderate, and plausible *defence*, which *Protestants*, or (to speak more particularly) which the Church of *England* makes for her discession, and reformation, is this. 1st. That they have a most certain *Rule* of their *Faith* (common to them with the rest of the Church Catholick,) the *Holy Scriptures*: and besides these, a summary thereof drawn up in the Apostles Creed, and explicated by the *first three Ages*, (*i. e.* the writings we have thereof) and the *first four General Councils*. And that, in the sincere belief of this primitive Rule, they rest secure, of believing all that is *necessary for salvation*; and likewise, of their retaining a firm-Communion, as to the *essentials* of Faith, with the *whole* Catholick Church, and even with that of *Rome*. 2ly. That the Roman Church is acknowledged by them a Catholick, but not the whole Catholick, Church; *one part* only of the Catholick Church

Church, as also the Church of *England* is *another*. 3ly That this Roman, or any other, part of the Church Catholick may *err*, whilst it still remains a part of the Catholick, in *non-fundamentals*. or non-essentials and necessaries. 4ly. That this part did *err* in such non-fundamentals, and that grievously; and that the Protestants, or Church of *England*, discovered these to be such grievous errors, by the light of *Scripture*, and testimony of *Antiquity*. 5ly. That this Roman Church added this also to her erring; that she exercised an unlawful dominion, or jurisdiction over the Church of *England*; and required an *assent* from this Church to such her *grievous errors*, upon pain of losing her Communion. 6ly. That the Church of *England* refused such *assent* to what, by clear Scripture, she had discovered to be *Errors*; as in conscience she was bound, though these had bin never so *small* ones; nay, though some of them were no Errors, yet if she were perswaded, they were so; how much more, when so *great*? 7ly. Proceeded, after mature consideration, to *reform* these Errors; but, in her self only, not imposing them upon, or condemning, by reason of them, any other Church for non-Catholick. 8ly. Whereas this her defence proceeds upon supposing the Romane Church, that she left, a *part* only, and not the *whole* Catholick Church; yet that, were it supposed to have bin the whole, or their departure to have bin from the whole also, as well as from it; that the *whole*, though granted in Fundamentals infallible, yet may *err* in *non-fundamentals*, or non-essentially necessaries, and that *grievously*; and consequently, if it should *require assent* from its members to *such* points, in which it is fallible, that they ought not to *assent* thereto, nor to conceal, if of consequence, when they any way discover, such Error; nay further also, that, if the General Church neglect it, they may, and ought, for themselves, to *reform* such Error.

§. 55. n. 2. And of the Catholicks Remonstrance.

But this *Plea* seems easily overthrown, in many of its particulars, by this following *Remonstrance*, made by the other side. 1. To the first, It is replied, 1 That there is a faith of *Agends*, or *Practicals*, (concerning what is *lawful*, and *unlawful*, and what is our duty to *do* or *forbear*,) as well as of *speculative* credends, which faith is necessary, and fundamental for attaining salvation; and in which *practical* points also may be, and have bin, *Heresies* and *Schisms*. I say; the *faith* of them necessary, because the *practice* of them is so; which must be groun ded on this faith; that they, are lawful, or ought to be practised. 2 That these points are of a much larger extent, then the speculatives; and that of

these we have no Collection, or Summary, drawn up by the Apostles, as we have of the *other*. 3 That, as these Protestants say, they do not, for the speculative Credends, rely barely on the *words* of the Apostles Creed, or any *private sence* of Scriptures; but profess to believe them according to the Explications made of them by the Church in her first four General Councils, and do place the security of their Faith, in them, not on their own judgment, but on their *conformity* to the judgment of these *Councils*; so it is all reason; that, for the *practicalls* also, they should rely on the Scriptures, only so as they are explicated by the Church in her General Councils. 4 That, for both these, (*speculatives*, or *practicals*,) as they do, or ought to rely, on the Explications of the *first four General Councils*; so, * that they cannot rationally confine their submissions to these alone, but do owe it also to *any* Councils of the Church following, in any age whatsoever: provided, that these be of *equal* authority: To which later Councils *new Heresies* may give like occasion of further explicating the Articles of our Faith; either in *speculatives*, or *practicals*; as new Heresies did after three ot four hundred years time, to the Explications made by those first Councils; and * that for the speculative Articles of the Apostles Creed, particularly that of *the Procession of the Holy Ghost à filio*, the Protestants have submitted to the Explications of Councils, after the four first, (and these too, Western Councils only, when the Greek Churches refused to consent to them; and that, as the Greeks say, upon not a verbal, but real, diversity in their faith, concerning this *procession*; yet, it seems, the Protestants here preferr'd, and thought fit to adhere rather to, the authority of the Western Churches.) From all which, it follows; that, if the Protestants dissent from the Explications of *such Councils* held in any Age, in either of these, *speculative*, or *practical*, *Articles* of their faith, that are necessary (of which necessity, it is fit also, the Council, not they, should judge), they cannot be *secure* of their retaining all *necessary* faith, so, as no way to have fallen from it into *Heresie*, or *Schism*: no more, then they will acknowledge, *Arrians*, and *Socinians* secure in their belief of the Apostles Creed, when departing from the Explications of the four first Councils. And thus is the Protestants *security* of their faith, if any way built or dependent on the first Councils, so also devolved on the perpetual conformity to the Decrees of other lawful General Councils, of what Ages soever, in all their Definitions. Again, 6 since *Schismaticks*, (I mean those, that are so in respect of their *spiritual Superiours*; by whom, in a line of subordination, they are joyned to the Head) as well as *Heretiсks*, are no members

members of the *Catholick* Church; and since all Schism doth not necessarily spring from some difference in the essentials of Religion, but may arise upon smaller matters, and occasions,‖ (any, wherein obedience is due); and, the lesser the occasion of it, the more criminal many times the Schism; therefore there is no security to Protestants in this first Branch of their Defence: that, becaus they agree with the whole Catholick Church in the Essentials of faith, hence they do still remain in its Communion. This said to the first.

‖ See Bishop *Bramhall* Reply to *Chalced.* p. 8. — Dr. *Field* l. 1. c. 13. — l. 2. c. 2. — Dr Hammond. *Schism.* 3 c. 3. and §. 9.

§. 55. n. 3.

2ly. To what follows it is replied, That the whole Catholick Church of Christ is but *one* body, compacted with a *due subordination* of its members, as well Churches, as persons, for the preservation of *truth*, and *peace*, among them; and the avoiding of Schism. 3ly. That the Church of *England* is a *member* of the Western Church, and *subordinate* to the *Patriarch* thereof, the Bishop of the prime Apostolick See, joyned with a *Council* composed of this Body. 4ly. That being a *part* of this Body, this Church, together with the rest of the Protestants, dissented, and departed from the *consenting* judgment, not only of one particular Church, the *Roman*; but of *all* the other *Occidental* Churches in several points of faith; that are *necessary*, as the other say; but, as themselves confess, that are of moment, and the failings in which are by them charged on the other side, as *grievous* errors, which will infer the contrary to be *needful truths*: disceded likewise from their consenting judgments concerning the testimony of Scriptures (rightly understood) and of the Fathers; affirmed by these not to be for, but against, them. 5ly, Departed both from them, and the most General Councils, that have bin held therein, for near this thousand years. 6ly. And departed from them in several points, wherin the *Eastern* Churches also consented, and do so still, with these *Occidental* Churches, and their Councils.

§. 55. n. 4.

7ly, And, for submission required to these doctrines, departed also from the *external communion*, not only of all the Western, but of the Eastern Churches, even of the whole visible Catholick Church of that Age, (of which in every Age is said, *Credo unam Sanctam Catholicam, & Apostolicam Ecclesiam*) wherein this discession was made. *From the external Communion* I say, so, as they neither could (nor yet can) communicate with any Church, Eastern, or Western, in their publick worship, and service of God; nor in the participation of the blessed Sacrament and Communion of the Altar. And, the *necessity* of such their universal discession, both, sufficiently appeareth from the modern *Eastern*, and *Roman* Missals, compared; the Masses of S. *Chrysostom*, & S. *Basil*, which (admitting som small variations‖) are the present service of all the Eastern, & Southern Churches, not

‖ See Cassand. liturg. c. p. 24, &c.

much differing from the *Roman*; and being, as well as the *Roman*, disallowed by Protestants: And also the *Discession* it self is confessed; both long ago by *Calvin*, lamenting the Protestant's want of Union amongst so many Adversaries || —— *A toto mundo discessionem facere coacti sumus.* And by Mr. *Chillingworth*, *l.*5. §. 55. —— *As for the external Communion of the visible Church*, (saith he) *We have without scruple formerly granted, that Protestants did forsake it* (i. e.) *renounce the practise of some Observances, in which the whole visible Church before them did communicate*; (See likewise, §. 56.89). *Forsake the external Communion of the whole visible Church*, i. e. (as he expounds himself, §. 32). *by refusing to communicate with any Church in her Liturgies, and publick Worship of God*; Thus he. And this, surely, was done for some Errors extant in this publick Worship; else, why did Protestants also reform this *publick Service*? And, these again, such Errors, as were not only held, and *used* in, but *justified*, and *allowed* by, this Church Catholick; and Obedience, and Conformity from her Subjects, required thereto: since if any thing, after the holy Scriptures, be held, by this Church Catholick, sacred, and authentick, and by all her Subjects to be embraced, and frequented, her publick *Liturgy*, and the most August *Sacrifice* of the *Altar* must be so. What ground therefore of Discession, and what just complaint the Protestants have against the Western Church, excluding them from her Communion, because requiring something in it, they cannot conform to; the same ground of complaint they have also against the Eastern Churches, as requiring somthing in their Communion, to which they cannot assent, nor in which join with them. This for the *external* Communion of the *Oriental*, as well as *Occidental*, Church, as to God's Publick Worship, & partaking of their Sacraments, forsaken by them; And next; as to any other Communion *internal* (mean-while) professed with these *Eastern* Churches in the *Fundamental* Faith, and *Essentials* of Religion, they can pretend none, but that they have (and confess they have) the same Communion with the *Western* Churches too. In what sence therefore they stand separated from the *Roman* Church, *viz.* in *external Communion* of their publick service of God, and receiving with that Church the blessed Sacrament, they stand separated from the Eastern also; and in what sence they still retain the Communion of the *East*, *viz.* in the *Essential*, and *Fundamental* Articles of Faith, they still retain this with *Rome*, as much as them. How is it then, that they say often, in the *Reformation* they left the *Roman* Church only

|| *Epist. P. Melanchthoni*, p.145.

not'

not the whole Catholick; numbring the *Greek*, *Russian*, *Abyssine*, and other Churches, as three parts of four; and all these, as on their side, and joined with them? And, to what purpose is the calculating, what proportion the Western Church hath to the whole Catholick; when as their separation, for communion external, is as much from the rest, as it; and both Churches, if any, for this their separation, equally culpable? and when as, for the internal Communion, (*i. e.* in all the Essentials of Faith) they maintain this no more with the rest of the great body of the Catholick Church, than they do with the *Roman*, or Western, Church?

But here again, if they alledg their further Union with the Eastern Churches, not in Fundamentals only, but also in some other Points not Fundamental (which are but few, and none of them, on the *Greek side*, *defined* by any former *Superior Council*) wherein these Churches oppose the *Roman*; among which is named the *Pope's Supremacy*, and *Infallibility of the Roman Church* (the later, a thing the *Roman* Church, taken singly, pretendeth not to), yet what will this help ||, as to those many other points, *defined by Superior Counsils* ||, and wherein both East, and VVest consent; as those mentioned in the third *Discourse*, §. 26. *&c*? In which Points chiefly, Protestants are questioned, for having made, in the *Reformation*, not a secession from their Western Mother to another part of the Catholick Church, but a discession from the consenting judgment of the whole Catholick.

|| See *Disc.* 3. §. 185.

|| See before §. 50. n. 2.

8. Departed from the whole in these points, (which were, at that time, of a general belief, and practice); not only so far as to *dissent*, but also as to *contradict*, and *reform*, against, them. 9. And all this, in several of these Controversies, upon pretence of the *clearness* of *those* Scriptures, the *sence* whereof, by a much major part of the West, and by the greatest Councils, that could for those times be assembled there, (where these Controversies arose), the sence also of the Eastern Church concurring in the same Doctrines, and interpretation of Scripture, was judged *clear* on the *other* side. 10. Of which Controversies, and matters in debate, if any were *in points necessary*; it must be granted, that such Councils, being universally accepted in such a sence as can only be rationally required ||, in these were *unerrable*; and might lawfully require, from their Subjects, *assent* thereto; Or at least, if *later* Councils faulty in demanding their Subjects *assent*; so must be the *four first*. that are allowed by Protestants. 11. To which *Councils* also, and not to their Subjects, must belong the *judgment* of what, or how many Points are to be accounted *necessary*; Or else, neither did

§. 55. n. 5.

|| See before, §. 38.

the judgment hereof belong to the four first Councils; nor could they justly, upon it, require assent, and join som such points to the Creed. 12. But if such Controversies be supposed *in non-necessaries*; yet, for the *peace* of the Church, after the determination of such a Council, the adverse party ought to acquiesce in *silence*, and *non-contradicting*, without either pronouncing that an Error, which such Council holds a Truth, or the Scripture clear for such a sence, as such Council disallows. 13. Or, If Protestants will not be obliged to this; why do they appeal to a free *General Council*, for deciding differences, and setling a peace? when they will neither yield the obedience of silence to the Definitions of such Councils, in points not necessary; nor grant, that any of the Controversies, concerning which they appeal to them, are points necessary, wherein such Council, universally accepted, may be submitted to, by them, as un-errable. The summe then is; That their *Reformation* was not from some *co-ordinate* Church attempting to tyrannize over them; as the second branch of their defence, and those following to the eighth, do import; but, from *their Superiors*: From these, not for somthing *held*, or *practised*, and not enjoined (for here, all having their liberty, was no cause to depart) but for points *defined*, and wherein *Conformity* was *required* by them; to whose judgment therefore they ought to have submitted so far, as to learn from it, in matters questioned, what is Truth and Error; Or, at least so far, as not to *contradict* it; and consequently, as, not to *reform against* it: In doing the contrary of which, they are charged as guilty of *Schism*, and of breaking the Laws of *Subordination*, and *Unity*, established in the Church ||. 14. Lastly, VVhereas, against such Obedience, an Obligation is pleaded (n. 6.) to do nothing against Conscience It is replied, that a man's conscience, miss-perswaded, that somthing is an Error, is to be followed indeed, and he, upon no command, to profess assent thereto; but excuseth not from guilt, nor freeth from the Church's Censures those, who might have better informed it ||. Thus the Remonstrance. After which well weighed, I see not, what security any one can have in continuing in such a Society, as hath thus broken the Links of Ecclesiastical Government, and lives in a separation from the main Body; if either the rejecting the *Definitions* of the Church's former Councils be *Heresie*; or relinquishing her *Communion*, *Schism*.

|| Of which see *Disc.* 2. §. 24. n. 1.

|| See Dr. *Hammond* of Schism, c. 2. §. 8.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

VI. *That, according to the former Concession, made in the Fifth Chapter, §. 32. (If so enlarged, as ancient Church-practice, and Reason requires,) all, or most of the Protestant Controversies are by former (obliging) Councils already decided, §. 56. n. 1, &c.*
An Instance hereof in the Controversie of the Corporal Presence in the Eucharist, or Transubstantiation. §. 57.

NOw to consider the *other Concession* || of more moderate Protestant Divines; * granting our Lord's assistance to the *Church Catholick* such, as that she shall also for ever be an *unerring* Guide in *Necessaries*: [a thing denied by Mr. *Chillingworth* ||, because of a Consequence thereof; which he foresaw; Namely, *That, we must take her judgment, and guidance also in this* point; *what points are fundamental, or necessary; and then who seeth not what will follow?* Namely, *That, We are to believe this Church in all Points, wherein she* saith, *she is unerring.*] And upon this,* granting also her *General Council*, or Representative, (she having no other way to teach, direct, define any thing; or, at at least, no other way so clear, and evident) to be unerring *in Necessaries*; provided, that such Council be universally accepted, and not opposed, or reversed by the Church Catholick in another following Representative; but received by a general, tacit at least, approbation, and conformity to its Decrees. (Where also it is conceded; that, a Council, for its meeting less *General*, yet, if having an universal acceptation, is equivalent thereto.) And hence making their frequent Appeal to these Councils, as the *supream* and ultimate Ecclesiastical *Court*, for setling Unity of Doctrine, and Peace, in the Church; and wherein, they promise victory to their Cause, and an end of Debates. Of which see before §. 32. *&c.*

§. 56. n. 1.
|| See before §. 41.-- and § 32, *&c.*
|| See before, §. 4.
* That according to those Conditions of determining controversies that can justly be required, most of those between Cathol. & Protestants have been already decided.

[*A General Council, after it is admitted by the whole 'Church, is then infallible* (saith the Archbishop ||) [*he means, 'in* Necessaries]——But Bishop *Bramhall* further,——*When inferior 'Questions* (saith he ||) *not fundamental, are once defined by a 'lawful*

§. 56. n. 2.
|| p. 346. Vindic. of the Church of England, p. 27.

'lawful General Council, all Christians, though they cannot assent in their judgments, are obliged to passive obedience, to 'possess their souls in peace, and patience. And they who shall 'oppose the Authority, and shall disturb the peace of the Church 'deserve to be punished, as Hereticks. And I submit (saith he‖) 'my self to the representative Church, that is, to a free General 'Council, or so general as can be procured. —— And Schism 'Guarded p. 136. There is nothing (saith he) that we long after 'more, then a General Council rightly called, rightly proceeding; 'or, in defect of that, a free Occidental Council, as general as may 'be —— See much more to this purpose said by this Bishop, before, '§. 34, &c. And thus Dr. Hammond‖, notwithstanding what is 'quoted out of him before §. 5. —— We do not believe, that any 'General Council truly such, ever did, or shall err in any matter 'of Faith; nor shall we further dispute the authority [I suppose he means) to oblige us] then we shall be duly satisfied of the universality of any such [Council] —— And Answer to Catholick 'Gentleman‖ —— A Congregation that is fallible, may yet have 'authority to make Decisions, and to require Inferiours so far to 'acquiesce to their Determinations, as not to disquiet the peace 'of that Church with their contrary Opinions. —— And‖ —— I 'acknowledge as much as C. G. or any man, the authority of a 'General Council against the dissent of a Nation, much more, of a 'particular Bishop. —— And —— The Belief, and Practises, we 'forsook, were not Doctrines defined by the Church: (saith Dr. 'Ferne‖).]

Reply to Chalced. Prefat.

‖ Of Heres. §. 14 n. 6.

§ c. 2. §. 3.

‖ Ibid. c. 8. §. 1. n. 7.

‖ Divis. Eng. and Rom. Ch. p. 59.

Upon such Concession concerning Councils universally accepted; and upon these appeals made to them, here are referred to the examination of all disinteressed, and conscientious Christians these *Considerables* following; (the design of this discourse).

§. 56. n. 3.

I. 1. The first Considerable is: Whether the *necessary* points, wherein our Lord is supposed perpetually *so* to assist his Church, or her general Councils universally accepted, as that she is *infallible*, and doth not err in the decision of them, and consequently, whereto all her subjects are obliged to yield their *assent*, ought not to be extended so far, as to comprehend some at least of those points, (I mean, either the *Negative*, or *Affirmative* of them,) the disputes about which, (as things of the *highest moment*) have so miserably afflicted the western Churches now for so long a time. The necessary consequence of the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, (as many Protestants maintain), is the committing of *Idolatry*, in worshipping a piece of bread for our Lord Christ. Is

not

not this point then necessary and Fundamental to Christian-Religion, that, in a Council meeting to decide it, the contrary to *Transubstantiation* should be therein determined? For the Affirmative can never be determined in such a Council, where the Negative is *necessary* to be believed? If the belief of Gods *essential Attributes* is a necessary and fundamental point of faith, is not the defining the contrary, and giving some of them to a creature, in allowing *Saint-Invocation*, (a thing with which Protestants charge the Roman Church) erring in a *Fundamental*? and if it be, then cannot a General Council, universally accepted, so define. The same may perhaps be said of many other points, Merit of works, VVorship of Images, Communion in one kind, according to what esteem many Protestants have of these errors, aggravated also by their fancy, that the *Pope* is *Antichrist*. But, suppose none of them to be innecessaries; yet they being affirmed by the more moderate Reformed to be errors very *grievous*, *damnable*, *&c.* then may not a right belief of them be thought necessary so far, as that the Catholick Church, and such a Council may be presumed to receive from our Lord a continual preservation in a right Faith of them, if the Error in them be pretended so grievous? And I desire that, for this, Dr. *Hammond*'s words, quoted below, §. 59. may be well weighed. As likewise, this to be considered, whether it is not all reason, that the Church, or these Councils, not private men, or Inferiors, should judge of this *Necessity*. ‖ Of Heresie, §. 13.

2ly. If this may not be granted; that any of these *modern* Controversies are about *Necessaries*; or the points such, that the Church Catholick, or her General Councils, universally accepted, in their Definitions, cannot err in them; and so an *assent* to such Definitions be due from her Subjects. The Second Considerable is: VVhether at least, when such Councils define them, all particular, *Persons*, and *Churches*, ought not to yield the external Obedience, to them, of *Silence*, and not any further *opposing*, or contradiction; without these private men's, or also Church's, reserving still to themselves, (lest some *Truth* should be thus oppressed), new *Remonstrances*, and Demonstrations, and a *Liberty*, (if upon these Remonstrances the Church Catholick neglect to assemble another Council; or, it called, err again in the result,) a *Liberty* I say (especially if it be a Church *National*) to *reform*, for themselves, such *Errors* of Councils. For, with such Reservations, what signifie their former appeals to, or to what purpose, any Meeting of, such Councils? when as §. 56. n. 4. 2.

1st. The present Controversies are not allowed to be in *Necessa-*

ries

ries, (in all which the *Roman* Church, and Reformed are said by them to be already fully agreed); 2 And then, they will yield neither any *internal*, nor *external* Obedience to any such *Conciliary* Decrees in the stating of *non-necessaries?* But, if such an external submission of *non-contradiction* be thought fit to be allowed, though that internal of *assent* cannot be obtained, yet this seems to secure the Church's peace: for thus a Controversie, once defined cannot be revived, to the disturbance thereof; and if they say, some Truth somtime may happen thus to suffer; yet, being in a non-necessary, (as they say it is) it may be spared; Neither, had this Duty been duly performed by our Ancestors, do I see, how the past *Reformation*, as to many points, could have found any entrance. And therefore, though some of the formerly recited appeals of Protestants promise fairly for such an *absolute* submission to Councils; yet the Archbishop seems to allow no more than a *conditional* one, and with an, *If*, or *Unless* still annexed.——I pray you look in him §. 32. p. 227.——*Far better* (saith he) *is that Inconvenience* [*viz.* of tolerating an Error, till another General Council meet] *than this other; that any authority, less than a General Council, should rescind the Decrees of it*; unless it err manifestly, and intolerably— And again, *Ibid.*——*No way must lie open to private men to refuse Obedience, till the Council be heard, and weighed: as well as that, which they say against it; yet with* Bellarmine's *Exception still* [here misse-applied, *Bellarmine* constantly denying, that a General Council, lawfully proceeding, and confirmed by the Pope, can err in any matter of Faith, the Bishop here affirming it.] so the Error be not manifestly intollerable. *Nor is it fit for private men, in such cases as this, upon which the whole Peace of Christendom depends, to argue thus; The Error appears, Therefore the Determination of the Council is* ipso jure *invalid. But this is far the safer way* (I say still, when the Error is neither fundamental, nor in it self manifest) *to argue thus: The Determination is by equal authority, and that* secundum jus, *according to Law, declared to be invalid, Therefore the Error appears.*

‖ De Concil. l. 2. c. 8.

§. 56. n. 5.

3. 3ly. If this submission of non-gainsaying at least, may be once granted; the third thing, recommended to a diligent Examination, is; Whether not only the *Roman*, but all the *Occidental* Churches, joined with the Western, and Prime Patriarch, (the *Exordium Unitatis*, as S. *Cyprian* ‖, with Bishop *Bramhall*'s approbation, stiles him) ‖, and the Councils that have been heretofore assembled in the West, be not, for the Doctrines, wherein

‖ Cyprian *de Unit. Eccles.*

‖ *Schism Guarded*, p. 4, 25.

We

we find the *Greek* Churches alſo conſenting with them, *in* ſuch a ſence *the whole*, as that any Chriſtian, eſpecially a Member of the VVeſtern Church, ought to take theſe for their ſupream Guide, in defect of any greater Meeting; and ought to yield obedience of *Aſſent* to them in defining Neceſſaries; or, in not Neceſſaries, of *non-contradiction*. And whether a more General, or any fuller, *acceptation* of the Definitions of ſuch Councils by the Church Catholick, (which acceptation alſo, if any Council, for the Meeting, is not ſo numerous as others have bin, ſupplies the defect) can rationally be required, than that, which is ſet down, before, §. 18,36,38.

4ly. Whether, moſt, or at leaſt ſome, of the chieſeſt points, of preſent Controverſie between Catholicks, and Proteſtants, have not been decided by former *Councils* ſo *accepted*. Which he may be pleaſed to examine in the points, mentioned, *Diſc.* 3. §. 26, *&c.* 4.

§. 57. The great controverſie of a Subſtantial Converſion in the Euchariſt examined according to the former Propoſals; whether a ſufficient deciſion hath not been already made by the Church therein.

But, for a preſent *Example*, I will annex here a brief relation ||, applied to the precedent Rules, of the paſt proceedings of the Church in the *deciſion* of one of the main points of Controverſie, which, notwithſtanding ſuch former deciſion, yet remains ſtill called in queſtion by the Reformed: Namely, whether in the Euchariſt there is a *Corporal Preſence of Chriſt*, and a *Subſtantial Converſion* of the Elements of Bread and Wine into his Body, and Blood?

This *Corporal Preſence*, and *Subſtantial Converſion* then (to relate the proceedings about it as briefly, as poſſibly I may) long ago *Berengarius*, and ſome Followers of his, denied; were complained of; two *Councils* called, one after another; at *Rome*, and at *Vercelles*, *Anno. Dom.* 1050. *Berengarius* ſummoned; and, he not appearing, his hetorodox Opinions condemned. He, (according to the now Proteſtant Grounds) thinking his, a Doctrine of great conſequence; and the Decree of theſe two Councils a *manifeſt Errour*; and that himſelf had evident *Scripture*, and *Demonſtration* againſt it, judged himſelf freed from the Obedience of *ſilence*, or non-contradiction to theſe Councils; and ſo he, with his Followers, publickly juſtified his old Tenent, deſiring a reverſing, by ſome new Council, of the former Sentence againſt it. Upon this reviv'd diſturbance of the Church, another *Council*, five years after, is aſſembled at *Tours*, 1055. not far diſtant from *Angers*, where he was *Arch-Deacon*. Here himſelf, with others of his party, was preſent; his Cauſe pleaded; his Demonſtrations conſidered; and, after all, his Opinion again condemned;

|| See *Baronius*, and *Blondel's Eſclairciſſ. ſur L' Euchariſt.*

himself also recanting it. The Council dismissed, he finds yet other *new Reasons*, or a *greater strength* in his former: and falls again to the abetting, maintaining, and spreading abroad his old Doctrine. A Fourth Council, upon these new Troubles of the Church, 1059. Four years after the last, was called at *Rome*; where himself also was present; some say, long Disputation there had; his *new* Plea for it found too light, and rejected, and his Opinion opposing Substantial Conversion, again condemned, both by himself, and by the Council, consisting of 103 Bishops. The third time this man revolts; and publisheth a *Writing* (answered by *Lanfranck*, afterward Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*) wherein he complains, that some particular Enemies of his swayed the former Council, and had made him to swear contradictions. These new Imputations occasioned a Fifth Council to be called at *Rome*, *A. D.* 1078. In which were new Disputings; his last Cavils censured; and the Article of a *Substantial Conversion* further vindicated; and his *Error* of the Substance of the Bread remaining, again condemned by this *Council*, and, *ultimately*, recanted by *himself*.

§.58. Such was the Sentence of five several Councils, if we may believe D. *Blondel* || (one reviewing another) against *Berengarius* and his Party, opposing a Corporal Presence, these Persons being present in three of these Councils, and pleading their Cause. The same *Arguments* (as will appear by the writers of those times, *Lanfranck*, *Guitmond*, *Algerus*, to any one, that pleaseth to peruse them) then refuted, that are still urged: the same *Authorities* out of Fathers then pressed, as are still produced anew by the Reformed, and with the same *Answers* repelled. All these Councils, (if some of them in the Members thereof less numerous, yet) universally accepted by all the VVestern Churches, where this Controversie was only agitated; Not one single Bishop thereof, that is known, dissenting, or siding with the *Berengarians*. Look we for more satisfaction yet? VVhen the Fervor of parties in this matter was much allayed; and the Church had had sufficient leisure to consider, and digest the former Conciliary Decrees; above a hundred years after the last of the Councils fore-mentioned, the great *Lateran* Council was assembled under *Innocent* the 3d. in which were present the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and of *Hierusalem* in person, and the Substitutes, * of the Patriarch of *Antioch*, then sick, *Episcopus Antheradensis*; and * of the *Alexandrian* Patriarch, lying under the *Sarazen* yoke, *Germanus* his Deacon. ‘’Tis true indeed

|| *Sur l' Eucharist*, c. 20

‹ indeed (as it is objected) that some of these Patriarchs were ‹ then *Latines*, because, both *Constantinople*, and *Hierusalem* being ‹ held in possession (the one, for near 60. the other, for near 100. ‹ years) by the *Latines*, *Latine* Pariarchs were then elected; (as ‹ somtimes *Greeks* also, by the power of the Emperors, have bin ‹ Bishops of *Rome*.); but yet they were the *Lawful*, and the *only* ‹ Patriarchs of those Sees in that time;] And present there were, besides these, a considerable number of other *Eastern* Bishops, the whole Council consisting of 412 Bishops, and 70 Archbishops. Now this Council again, in stead of reversing, declared for a *Substantial Conversion*, where also first, (*i. e.* in a Council) was used the name of *Transubstantiation*. Two hundred years after this again; the Council of *Florence* declared likewise for the same, in the Articles of Instruction to the *Jacobines*, and *Armenians*, in these words—*Ipsorum verborum Christi virtute, substantia panis in Corpus Christi, & substantia vini in sanguinem, convertuntur.* Which declaration, though made after the departure of the *Greeks*, (whom the Turks Invasion hastned away) yet it was fully agreeable to their doctrine: Nor had the Latine, and Greek Church then any *difference* concerning the *Substantial Conversion* of the Elements into Christs Body, but only *by what words* this mutation was effected. For which thing see the plain Confession of Bishop *Forbes* ‖, against *Chemnitius*, and others of his own party. And all these, without any opposition; or the Church-Catholick's assembling it self in any other Council, in so many Centuries, for to reverse such a *Decree*. If there was; let it be named.

‖ *De Euch.* p. 412. See below, *Disc.* 3. §. 158.

§. 59.

Now, if the Decree of so many Synods, so often weighing the Adversaries reasons and evidences, was not sufficient for setling such a point, at least as to the obedience of future *silence*, and non-contradiction, and as to suffering the Church to enjoy her peace, what can hereafter be sufficient? Or, can we ever hope, that any controversie shall be finally determined, or ended by any future Council, if this is not by these forepast? Can there be any ground here to question the integrity, or lawful proceedings of so many Councils, at such a distance from one another, all concurring in the same judgment, for a corporal Presence, and a substantial mutation? Or, can there be any new Light in this Point (since there are no new Revelations) attainable in these present times, which those were not capable of? Or, if there could, is not much the major part of the present Clergy, and Ecclesiastical Governors of Christianity still swayed on the same

side, against any present evidence pretended?

‖ Of Heresie, §. 13. n. 2,3. *If we consider* (saith Dr. *Hammond* ‖) *Gods great, and wise, and constant Providence, and Care over his Church; his desire, that all men should be saved, and in order to that end, come to the knowledge of all necessary Truth; his promise, that he will not suffer his faithful Servants to be tempted above what they are able; nor permit Scandals, and False Teachers to prevail to the seducing of the very Elect, his most pious godly Servants; If, I say, we consider these, and some other such like General Promises of Scripture, wherein this Question* [about the Errability of Councils] *seems to be concerned, we shall have reason to believe; that God will never suffer all Christians to fall into such a temptation, as it must be in case the whole Representative should* err in matter of faith. [I add, to define, therein, any thing contrary to the Apostles *depositum*, and which, Christians may not safely believe; or, without idolatry, *practise*], *and therein find approbation and reception among all those Bishops, and Doctors of the Church diffused, which were out of the Council. And though in this case the Church might remain a Church, (and so the destructive gates of hell not prevail against it) and still retain all parts of the Apostle's* Depositum *in the hearts of* some *faithful Christians, which had no power in the Council to oppose the Decree; or, out of it, to resist the General approbation; yet still the testimony of such a General Council, so received, and approved, would be a very strong Argument, and so, a very dangerous temptation to every meek and pious Christian; and it is piously to be believed, though not infallibly certain, — That God will not permit his Servants to fall into that Temptation.* — [Thus Dr. *Hammond*; whose words I desire may be seriously considered with application to this great Controversie of *Christ's Presence* in the *Eucharist*, and the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*.] *We do not believe* (saith the same Doctor ‖) *that any General Council, truly such, ever did, or shall* err in any matter of Faith. ‖ *We are most ready in all our differences to stand to the judgment of the truly Catholick Church, and its lawful Representative, a free General Council* ‖: *Or, in defect of that, a free Occidental Council* ‖, saith Bishop *Bramhal*. *It seems very fit, and necessary for the peace of Christendom, that a general Council* [supposed] *thus erring, should stand in force, till evidence of Scripture, or demonstration, make the Errors to appear, as that another Council of equal authority reverse it.* Saith Arch-Bishop *Laud* ‖ — Again. *An Argument necessary, and demonstrative is such* (saith he) *as, being proposed to any man, and understood, the Mind cannot chuse, but inwardly assent unto it. So it is not enough to think, or to say it is demonstrative; the light of a*

‖ *Ibid* §. 14. n. 6.

‖ See before, §. 56 n. 2.

‖ Vind. c 2. p. 9.

‖ *Schism Guarded*, p. 136

‖ p. 227.

demon-

demonstrative Argument is the evidence, which it hath in its self to all that understand it. Well: but because all understand it not; If a quarrel be made [as was by *Berengarius* four or five times] *Who shall decide it? No question, but a General Council.——For if it be evident to any man, then to so many learned men, as are in a Council, doubtless: And if they cannot but assent, it is hard to think them so impious, that they will define against it. And if that which is thought evident to any man, be not evident to such a grave Assembly, its probable its no Demonstration, and the Producers of it ought to rest, and not to trouble the Church*||. Thus Arch-bishop *Lawd.* Pag. 245, 246. How then I say in the present point, can the *reformed*, reviving the former Argumeuts of *Bertram*, *Scotus Erigena*, *Berengarius*, *&c.* still trouble the Church again with urging of them, after the judgment of so many Councils already passed upon them: If the reformed tie us to obedience, as of *assent*, when the Council brings *evident Scripture*, or *Demonstration*; so of *Silence*, when we cannot bring *it* against the Council; and, after our bringing what we think Demonstrative, tie us to stand to the judgment of the Council, whether it be so, or no; From hence it follows; that, as we may not gain-say a second Council, after our Demonstrations proposed, and disallowed by it; so we may not gain-say the former, or the very first Council, if we produce no *new* demonstrations, but such as were considered by such Council, and rejected. Now, if Councils are thus to judg of Demonstrations brought against their former Decrees, and the Contradictour to acquiesce in their judgment; Can any desire a fairer Judicature by Councils in any matter (for *silencing* future *disputes*; if not, for *uniting* variety of *opinions*), than there have already bin, of this? And is there any reason, that Protestants should refer themselves in this point (as they do) to the judgment of a new Council? If all these Councils, successively, erred in this point so *manifestly*, as that they could not lawfully oblige their subjects, (especially bringing no new Arguments,) to *silence*; the next, and the next to that, of such Councils, as ever we can hope for, may err so too; and the same obedience of *silence* be denied to them; whilst, one pretended Evidence, or Demonstration quelled, another new one starts up, and demands satisfaction.

§. 60. But if these Councils be invalid for establishing the *belief*, or at least the *non-opposition*, of a *substantial Conversion*. Let us see the proceedings of the Reformation here to repeal their Acts, and establish the contrary to them.

After all these Councils forenamed, and that of *Trent*, added

to them *A. D.* 1562. a *Synod* is called at *London* of two Provinces only of the West, consisting of about twenty four Bishops, and two Metropolitans. And by these, against all the former Councils aboveſaid, it is decreed ‖; *That the* change *of the* substance *of the bread, and wine in the Eucharist, is repugnant to the* plain *words of Scripture; and overthrows the* nature *of a Sacrament.* [If then the rest of *Christendom* have no more, then Protestants here say they have; for many ages they have had *no Sacrament* of the Lords Supper amongst them.] Next; in obedience to this their decree, they tie their subjects not to *silence*, or a *non-contradiction* of it, but to subscribe ‖ *that they acknowledge it,* [i. e. confess, believe, it] *to be agreeable to the Word of God,* [i.e. to be true]: An obedience, which themselves, though subjects, do deny to the decree of all those preceding Councils, wherein the judgment of all the Bishops and Metropolitans of the then western world concurred, and amongst the rest, those of these two Provinces also, yet doth their Synod require it.

‖ Article 28.

‖ Synod. 1603 Can. 63

§. 61.

And their requiring this, thought to be rationally, thus, defended; Because, *Though it is not impossible, but that such Synod may err: yet it may be certain, that in somthing it doth not err*‖——And so, to such point may enjoyn assent. *becaus the thing determined is so evident in Scripture, as that all denying of it must be wilful.*‖ But mean-while, you see, all these Councils have denied, what this Synod of twenty six Bishops is certain of; and certain, from evidence of Scripture; *an evidence*, the perusal of which all those Councils had, as well as these. Here let a sober Christian judge, if assent be held due to this *London*-Synod, upon such a pretended certainty of theirs; is it not to those other much rather? *to those others*, I say, incomparably more numerous; accepted by the whole West for many Ages; and adhered-to still by the greatest part thereof; having before them the *Scriptures*, and the *traditive* Exposition of them; weighing the Arguments that are still on foot; meeting so often; and concluding still in the same Judgment. But; if these other Councils are justified, by the practice of this *English* Synod, either in their requiring *assent*, or at least *silence*; thus is the *Reformation* rendred unlawful; as likewise their appeal to future Councils; which can afford us no more just satisfaction, than the forepast. As for that refuge, usually sought, in flying to the contrary judgment, or *non-acceptance*, of the *Eastern Churches* in this point, it helps not. For 1st, (besides a considerable presence of *Grecian* Bishops, that there was in some of these Councils) as to a *tacit-approbation* or non-opposition in this point, the Greek Churches have never bin found to have made

‖ Mr. Stillingfleet p 542.
‖ Mr. *Whitby.* p. 100.

made the least *anti-declaration*. And 2ly. You may see below, *Disc.* 3. §. 158. the Testimonies both of their own Writers, and also of several Protestants, shewing their accord herein with the Western Churches.

§. 62.

As for the Appeal, that is made by many to our *sences*, that they may be consulted rather, than the *Church*, or the *Fathers*, (who yet had as perfect an information from their sences, as we from ours,) for the decision of this point; and as for the many *contradictions* that are mustered up by them ‖, out of Philosophy, and from natural reason, against it. 1st, I think all are here agreed, that the *contrary testimony* of *sence*, or the seeming *contradictions* of *Reason* are not to be regarded, where *Divine Revelation* declares any thing to be Truth.

‖ See Mr. *Tillotsons* Rule of faith, p. 271. —Dr. *Tailor* Real price, p. 207, &c. 251. &c. —*Stillingf.* Rat. account. p. 117 & 567. ‖ p. 567.

'*That which I am now upon* [saith Mr. *Stillingfleet* ‖ in the 'place where he urgeth such contradictions of sence, and reason, 'to Transubstantiation] *is not, how far reason* [I add, *or sence*], '*is to be submitted to divine Authority in case of certainty, that* 'there is a divine *Revelation for what I am to believe.* This 'saith enough; But give me leave to add the judgment of two 'or three Protestants more in this matter, here a little to check 'the forwardnesse of those, who so peremptorily admit the arbi-'trement of *sence*, and *natural reason*, in mysteries of Religion.

'The 1st is, that submission of Dr. *Tailours* in Real Presence, '(p. 240.) after he had numbred up many apparent contradicti-'ons, not only in respect of a *natural*, but (as he saith) of an *ab-'solute* possibility of *Transubstantiation*, (from p. 207. *to* 237.) ——*Yet, saith he,*——*Let it appear that God hath affirmed Tran-'substantiation, and I for my part will burn all my Arguments a-'gainst it, and make publick amends.* [*All my Arguments*, (i.) 'of apparent contradictions, and absolute impossibilities] —— 'And p. 237. To this objection, that we believe the doctrine, *of 'the Trinity*; and *of the Incarnation*; *of our Saviours being born 'of a pure Virgin, &c. clauso utero*; and of the *Resurrection with 'identity of bodies* (in which the Socinians find absurdities and con-'tradictions) notwithstanding seeming impossibilities; and ther-'fore why not Transubstantiation? He answers, *That if there 'were as plain Revelation of* Transubstantiation, *as of the other 'then this Argument were good*; *and if it were possible for a 'thousand times more Arguments to be brought against* Tran-'substantiation, *yet* (saith he) *we are to believe the Revelation in 'despight of them all.* [Now I pray you observe, that none can 'believe a thing true, upon what motive soever, which he first

'knows

'knows certainly to be false, or (which is all one) certainly to contradict, or to be, not *naturally*, but *absolutely* impossible (which therefore, it is strange, that Dr. *Tailour* affirms himself to know concerning Transubstantiation)||: For these, we say, are not verifiable by a divine power; and therefore here I may say; should divine power declare a Truth, it would transcend it self]. —— Again, (in *Liberty of Prophecy* §.20. n.16.) he saith, —— '*Those who believe the Trinity in all those Niceties of Explications, which are in the School, and which now adays pass for the Doctrine of the Church, believe them with as much violence to the Principles of Natural, and Supernatural Philosophy, as can be imagined to be in the point of Transubstantiation,* [Yet I suppose himself denies no doctrine about the *Trinity*, that is commonly delivered in the *Schools*.] The next is that grave admonition of that learned, and moderate Prelate, Bishop *Forbes*. —— *Admodum periculosè* (saith he) *& nimis audacter negant multi Protestantes Deum posse panem substantialiter in Corpus Domini convertere. Multa enim potest Deus omnipotens facere supra captum omnium hominum, imo & Angelorum. Id quidem, quod implicat contradictionem, non posse fieri concedunt omnes; sed quia in particulari nemini evidenter constat, quæ sit uniuscujusque rei essentia, ac perinde quid implicet, & quid non implicet contradictionem, magnæ profectò temeritatis est, propter cæca mentis nostræ imbecillitatem, Deo limites præscribere; & præfractè negare, omnipotentia sua, illum hoc vel illud facere posse.* —— And (p 395.) —— *Certè haud pauca* (saith he) *credimus omnes, quæ, si ratio humana consulatur, non minus impossibilia esse, & contradictionem manifestam implicare videntur, quam ipsa Transubstantiatio*; instancing there in the doctrine of the Resurrection of the *same numerical* Body. —— And he goes on, (p.388.) '*Placet nobis judicium Theologorum Wirtembergicorum in confessione suâ.* Anno 1552. *Consilio Tridentino proposita, cap. de Eucharistiâ. Credimus, inquiunt, Omnipotentiam Dei tantam esse, ut possit in Eucharistiâ substantiam panis & vini vel annihilare, vel in Corpus & sanguinem Christi mutare. Sed quod Deus hanc suam absolutam Omnipotentiam in Eucharistiâ exerceat, non videtur esse certo verbo Dei traditum, & apparet veteri Ecclesiæ fuisse ignotum.* The third is *Calvins* Confession of faith, || written two years before his death, and directed to the Emperor, and Princes of *Germany*. —— *Porrò* (saith he) *qui nos accusant, quod Dei potentia derogetur à nobis, valdè sunt in nos injurii. Non enim hîc quæritur, quid Deus possit, sed quid verbo suo velit, extrâ quod nihil nobis quærendum, ut hoc, aut illud divinemus. Quare illam quæstionem omittemus, an Deus possit*

p 107, 236.

Vid. Harmonia Confess.

Lib. Epist p. 570.

possit facere, ut Christi Corpus sit ubique; sed cum omni modestiâ intra istos Scripturæ fines consistimus, quæ perhibet, Christum induisse corpus nostro corpori per omnia simile —— Interea extollimus Dei potentiam magis, quam illi, qui nos istiusmodi probris infamant. Fatemur enim ipsam illam Christi à nobis, secundum humanam naturam, distantiam non impedire, quò minùs in seipso nos vivificet, habitet in nobis, nosque adeo participes reddat ipsiusmet substantiæ *corporis sui, & sanguinis, virtute incomprehensibili Sancti sui Spiritus. Ex quo apparet merè calumniosum esse, quod nobis imponitur: quasi nempe figeremus suos terminos Dei potentiæ ex placitis Philosophorum; atqui omnis nostra Philosophia una est, simpliciter admittere, quod Scriptura nos docet.* ——And, *de vera Christianæ pacificationis ratione*, c. 11. speaking of the Eucharist—— '*Quasi vero* (saith he) *hic de Christi potentia disputetur.* —— *Rerum omnium conversionem fieri posse à Christo nos quoque fatemur.*]

This then I hope may be said, with the approbation of Protestants, that the interposings of *sence* (though indeed in the Eucharist there is no error in our *sences*, all that being really there, which they perceive there; but in our *reason* only; arguing from the position of the *accidents* to the position of the *subject*) or the interposing of *Reason*, and *Philosophy*, are not to be hearkned to in this matter, till first it be cleared, what is the divine Revelation concerning it: which divine Revelation so often as it appears to have declared auy thing contrary to them, we may, with modesty enough, use that expression of *F. Cressies*, causlesly censured, ‖ *That We have learnt, not to* answer *such Arguments, but to* despise *them.* ‖ *Tillots*, p. 276.

§. 64. 2. 2ly, All thus acknowledging their submission to *divine Revelation*; This hath bin produced out of the *Scriptures*, For a *corporal* presence of Christs Body, and a *Conversion* of the consecrated Elements into it. Many texts urged, if taken in their most *literal, proper*, and *natural* sence, very expres for it. as *Mat.* 26.26. —— *Mark* 14. 22. —— *Luke* 22.19. —— *Jo.* (who, speaking of it here, omits it in the History of the Passion) 6.51,53,54. —— 1 *Cor.* 11. 24,27,29. —— 10.16. It being very observable here, 1st, That the *words of Institution* are still repeated punctually by four several sacred Writers, (*Matthew, Mark, Luke*, and *Paul*) without any *variation*, or Exposition of any impropriety: whereas it is not usuall so constantly to retain, without Explication, a *tropical*, or *figurative* speech; especially in a matter, where the *truth* is so necessary to be known. 2 Again, that the fourth of these Writers, cautiously as it were, useth not his own stile in this matter, as in others; but chuseth to deliver our Lords commands punctually

ctually in his own words, [*what I have received, that I deliver, &c.*] And 3 That our Saviour also in these words seconds his first expression *Hoc est Corpus meum* (without changing afterward any *impropriety* in them) with the like words following *Hic est sanguis*; and then confirmeth both these with a *quod tradetur* and *qui effundetur*(*i*) on the Cross, to shew he was real in these words, and meant no *Figure*. Notwithstanding this, the true *sence* of these Scriptures was called in question by a party (not now only, but eight hundred years ago) contending, that they were, not properly but figuratively to be understood. And upon this, the usual remedy, for the right understanding of Scriptures controverted, was, then, repaired to; and the same *supreme Ecclesiastical Judge* consulted, for deciding and declaring the true, and *traditive* sence of these Scriptures, in this important controversie concerning the *real, substantial, corporeal* presence of our Lords Body, as was formerly for declaring the traditive sence of the Scriptures controverted, concerning *the Divinity of Christ*. A General Council, (*i.e.* the most general that the times would permit) was assembled in the West, in our Forefathers days, nay, of these more than one; as hath bin shewed||; a *substantial Conversion* of the Elements, and a *corporal Presence* declared to be the *traditive* sence of these Scriptures; and a *reverence* suitable required in this great *mystery*; not one Bishop in these Councils, for any thing we know, in the whole Church of God at that time dissenting; and those of the Eastern Churches, absent, consenting in the same judgment||: what, more can be done? Ought not sence, reason, philosophy, here to be *silenced*? and ought not such a Decree to be, if not assented to, yet (even in the judgment of those learned Protestant Divines before quoted||) acquiesced in, so far, as not to be by any *contradicted*?

|| §.57, &c.

|| See Disc.3. §. 158.

|| § 56.n.2.-59.

§. 65. 3. But 3ly, what, now, if many of those contradictions, and absurdities, which are urged against the *corporeal presence* of the Catholicks, do as much overthrow that *real presence*, that is maintained by Protestants, I mean the Calvinists, and so many in the Church of *England*, as have not deserted their Forefathers; and, to flie the farther from the *Church of Rome*. are gone quite over into the Camp of *Zuinglius*, changing a *real* into meerly a *spiritual* presence; or a presence only of Christs *Spirit*, uniting the worthy Communicant here on earth to his Body in Heaven? But heretofore at least, it hath bin the common Tenent of the English Divines, to affirm not only a *spiritual* presence, or a presence only by *effect*, *operation*, or *grace*, but a *substantial* presence, in the *Eucharist*, (and that is here *on earth*), not to the *Elements* indeed,

but

but to the *worthy Receiver*, of the very same Body of Christ, that suffered on the Cross, and that is now, at the same time, as *here*, also in *heaven*.

§. 66.

['To which purpose thus *Calvin* in 1 *Cor.* 11. 24.— 'Neq; *enim mortis suæ beneficium nobis offert Christus; sed Corpus* 'ipsum *in quo passus est, & resurrexit.*——And *Institut.* l. 4. c. 17. '§. 7.——*Neq; enim mihi satisfaciunt, qui dum Communionem cum* 'Christo *ostendere volunt, nos spiritus modò participes faciunt, præte-* 'ritâ *carnis, & sanguinis mentione. Quasi vero illa omnia de nihi-* 'lo *dicta forent; carnem ejus verè esse cibum*, &c. *non habere vitam,* 'nisi *qui carnem illam manducaverit*, &c. ——§. 9. *Quæ omnia* 'non *posse aliter effici intelligimus, quin totus* [Christus] *spiritu, &* 'corpore *nobis adhæreat.* So Dr. *Tailor*, Real Presence, *p.* 288. 'pronounceth Anathema *to those, who do not confess the Eucharist to* 'be *the flesh of our Saviour, which flesh suffered for us.*——And *p.* 5. 'expounds *spiritual Presence* (put in the Title of his Book) *only to* 'exclude the Corporal, and natural manner. [not *spiritual* there- 'fore, so as to exclude *Corpus Domini*; but only the *corporal*, or 'natural manner of that body:] now by excluding the natural 'manner is not meant (surely) the exclusion of *Nature*, or the 'thing it self; (For then, to say, a thing is there, not after a *natu-* 'ral manner; were as much, as to say; the *thing* is not there;) 'but the exclusion of those *Properties*, which usually accompany 'Nature, or the *thing*. And *p.* 12. he saith—— *When the word* 'Real Presence *is denied by some Protestants, it is taken for* Na- 'tural Presence [which Natural Presence, he well knows, the 'Roman Church also denies]. *and not for Presence in rei veritate.*] 'And thus Mr. *Hooker*, l. 5. §. 67. *p.* 357.—*Wherefore should* 'the world *continue still distracted, and rent with so manifold conten-* 'tions; *When there remaineth now no controversie, saving only about* 'the *Subject, where Christ is?* —— *Nor doth any thing rest doubtful* 'in *this; but whether, when the Sacrament is administred, Christ be* 'whole *within man only; or else his Body, and Bloud be also external-* 'ly *seated in the very consecrated Elements themselves.*——And *p.* '359.—*His Body, and his Bloud* (saith he) *are in that very subject,* 'whereunto *they minister life, not only by effect, and operation even* 'as *the Influence*, &c. See also Bishop *Andrews* Resp. ad Apol. 'Bell. c. 1. p. 11. *Nobis vobiscum de objecto convenit; de modo lis* 'omnis *est*, &c.——*Præsentiam* (*inquam*) *credimus, nec minus* 'quam *vos, veram. De modo Præsentiæ nil temerè definimus.*—*non* 'magis *quam in Christi incarnatione*, &c.]

§. 67. Would not one think here; that, touching the *Substantial* (and, may not I say, *corporal*, so it be understood with Dr. *Tailor*, not after the *natural* manner of bodies) *Presence* of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, all were agreed? And the question only, (as *Hooker*) whether it be to, and within, the *Receiver* only; or also externally seated in the *consecrated Elements*? And then, though not the deceptions of sence concerning the Bread, yet, (which is much harder,) the mauy contradictions about the *same* Body, or Entity (if you will), its being *at once* in *diverse* places, its being deprived of its *dimensions*, &c. do not they press in to disturb the Protestant's belief in this matter, as well as the Catholick's? Surely some such thing was considered by the *English Synod* in Queen *Elizabeth*'s days, 1562. when they both cast out of the 28th. of the former Articles of Religion, made in the end of King *Edward*'s Reign, these words following. ——[*Cum humanæ Naturæ veritas requirat, ut unius, ejusdemq; hominis corpus in multis locis simul esse non possit, sed in uno aliquo, & definito loco esse oporteat; idcirco Christi Corpus in multis & diversis locis, eodem tempore, præsens esse non potest. Et quoniam, ut tradunt Sacræ Literæ, Christus in Cœlum fuit sublatus, & ibi usq; ad finem sæculi est permansurus, non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus, & sanguinis* realem præsentiam *in Eucharistiâ vel credere, vel profiteri*]: And also cast out a *Rubrick*, or Declaration to the same purpose, inserted in King *Edward*'s 2d. Common-Prayer-Book, which gives this Reason, why *no Adoration* ought to be done to any *real*, and *essential* Presence of Christ's natural Flesh, and Bloud in the Eucharist; *because the natural Body, and Bloud of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not there; it being against the truth of Christ's Natural Body to be at one time in more places, than one*; though, (I believe to the great grief, and dislike of many of the true Sons of this Church), the same *Rubrick* hath gotten in again into the late *English* Liturgy; But the other clause is not, hitherto, readmitted into the Article.

§. 68. And, if there were not also some *seeming Absurdities*, and *Contradictions* in these Protestant's stating of the *Real Presence*, why call they the manner *ineffable*; *full of Miracles*; *and not apprehensible by reason*? ——*Ego hoc Mysterium* (saith *Calvin* ||) *minime rationis humanæ modo metior, vel naturæ legibus subjicio.*—— *Humanæ rationi minime placebit* [that which he affirms] *penetrare ad nos Christi carnem, ut nobis sit alimentum.*——*Dicimus Christum tam externo Symbolo, quam Spiritu suo, ad nos descendere, ut verè substantia carnis suæ animas nostras vivificet*——*In his paucis verbis*

|| *Instit. l.4.c 17.24.*

qui

qui non sentit multa subesse miracula, plusquam stupidus est; quando —nihil magis incredibile, quam res toto cœli, & terræ spatio dissitas, ac remotas, in tanta locorum distantiâ, non tantùm conjungi, sed uniri; ut alimentum percipiant animæ ex carne Christi.——And §. 32.——*Porrò de modo, si quis me interroget, fateri non pudebit, sublimius esse arcanum, quàm ut vel meo ingenio comprehendi, vel enarrari verbis, queat.*——And §. 25.——*Captivas tenemus mentes nostras, ne verbulo duntaxat obstrepere; ac humiliamus, ne insurgere audeant.*——And (in his Confession of Faith ‖)——*Nos fatemur omnino rationem. quâ cum Christo communicamus,* ad miraculum *referendam esse.* Therefore as these *Protestants* charge the *Roman Transubstantiation* with contradictions, absurdities, impossibilities; so do the *Zuinglians*, *Remonstrants*, *Socinians*, as freely charge their *Real Presence.* See the *Remonstrant's* Apology, c. 23. who thus dispute against them——*Quomodo enim non credibile sed possibile esse, imo quomodo non impossibile, adeoq; absurdum videri debet, Corpus Christi quod est, & manet in Cœlis, & non alibi, vere communicari nobis, qui in terrâ sumus, & non alibi, ita ut nobis cedat in cibum?* ——And afterward, p. 251. they say,——*Omnia ista non modò obscura, & incomprehensibilia esse, sed manifestè etiam in se continere, tum vanitatem, tum absurditatem——Et ineffabilia illa mysteria humanam seu curiositatem, seu superstitionem, in hoc tam simplici, tam plano, & a nullo non ingenio facile perceptibili ritu, finxisse potius, quàm reperisse; ——qui postquam a simplici Scripturæ phrasi semel discesserunt, admirationibus inexhaustis se pascere malunt, quàm clarâ veritatis scientiâ.* And the *Socinians* accuse this Opinion of the *Calvinists*, and *English* Church. ——*Eam cum sanæ mentis ratione pugnare, quæ dicitur fieri non posse, ut Christi Corpus, tanto intervallo a nobis disjunctum, in cœnâ revera comedamus. Idcirco & ille ipse qui sententiæ istius author est, fatetur se hoc Mysterium nec mente percipere, nec linguâ explicare posse.*

‖ *Lib. Epl* p. 572.

‖ *Volkel. l. 4. c. 22.*

And thus also *Rivet* ‖ against it; ——*Si Corpus Christi non est in Sacramento quantitativè* [(i. e.) corporally, or *secundum modum corporis*] *non est* omninò; *quia Corpus Christi ubicunq; est, quantum est, aut non est Corpus.* Now if it be said here, that though the Real Presence of Protestants, to the *worthy Receiver*, admits indeed some seeming contradictions: yet doth the *Roman* Real Presence to the *Symboles* suffer many more. 1*st* I answer, that a Tenent involving one true contradiction, is as far removed from Truth, as that which involves a hundred. And 2*ly*. That I know no just bounds, but that, if *ineffable, incomprehensible*, may be used for salving three, or four seeming impossibilities, so it may be, for forty.

‖ *Animad. in Grot. p. 85.*

§. 69. As for the Fears ſuggeſted by ſome ‖ ——*That, if the judgment of all mens ſences is not to be relied on in the matter of the Euchariſt, then it will be impoſſible to give any ſatisfactory account of the grand Foundations of Chriſtian Faith. For what aſſurance can be had of any Miracles*, &c? *Why not the Apoſtles be deceived in Chriſt's being riſen from the grave? For might it not be an inviſible Spirit under the Accidents of Chriſt's Body? And, ſince hearing may fail, as well as ſight, may not we thus queſtion all Church-Tradition? That nothing is to be admitted by us as certain, which admitted, we can be certain of nothing*, &c. As for ſuch Tragical Conſequences, I ſay, they need not much terrifie us.

‖ Still p. 117. 567.--Tillots. p. 275.

§. 70. For 1ſt. If it be not true in the Euchariſt, I ſuppoſe it is in another inſtance; that under the outward accidents, and appearances to the ſences of one body was contained the ſubſtance, or preſence of another; *viz.* under the external appearance of *men*, the perſons of *Angels*; ſo that the ſences of all men, that looked upon them, were actually miſtaken, *Gen.* 18. 19. And ſo would ſo many more, as had beheld them. Doth it follow now from this *deception* of *Sence*, or *Reaſon* here, (which cannot be denied), that, after this, *it is impoſſible to give any ſatisfactory account of the grand Foundations of Chriſtian Faith*; or, *that any aſſurance can be had of Miracles*, &c. *Or* laſtly, *That we can be, thence-forward, certain of nothing?* If not; how follows it from the like *ſupernatural* Operation ſuppoſed in the *Euchariſt?* An Argument drawn from our *Sences* is not, from any of theſe ſupernatural effects deceiving ſence, weakned for proving any Truth, ſave only in ſo many Particulars, wherein we have, or pretend, *divine Revelation* concerning ſuch deception of our ſence. If then there be ſuch *Divine Revelation* for a deception of ſence, or natural reaſon, in the *Euchariſt*, I hope all will ſee theſe aggravating conſequences to be vain. But 2ly If this *Revelation* be miſtaken, yet cannot that deception of ſence, which is only believed upon its *ſuppoſal*, be from hence juſtly extended to any other thing, where this is *not ſuppoſed*. So that, whether ſuch Revelation be, or be not, Catholicks, and the truth, in ſuch haſty, and unweighed Argumentations, are much wronged. This (from §. 62.) I have annexed, though ſomwhat beſides the deſign of this Diſcourſe, that the *reluctances* of our *Sence*, or *Natural Reaſon* may do no prejudice to our *Faith*, and humble *ſubmiſſion*, (in this great Myſtery), to the *Traditions* of the Church, and *Definitions* of Councils.

The End of the firſt Diſcourſe.

THE SECOND DISCOURSE.

Proceeding (upon the Conceſſions of Learned Proteſtants; That the Paſtors of the Church, ſome or other, in all Ages, do infallibly guide their Subjects in Neceſſaries) to ſearch, which, in any Diviſion of theſe Paſtors, are thoſe, to whom Chriſtians ought to adhere, and yield their Obedience.

THE CONTENTS.

PRoteſtants grant,

1ſt. *That there is at this preſent, an One, Holy, Catholick, and Apoſtolick Church* §. 1. Chap. 1.

2ly. *That the preſent Paſtors, and Governors thereof have authority to decide Controverſies.* §. 2.

3ly. *That theſe Governors (ſome, or other of them) ſhall never err, or miſs-guide Chriſtians, at leaſt in abſolute Neceſſaries to Salvation.* §. 3.

4ly. *That they, and the Church governed by them, ſtand al-*

ways distinct from Heretical, or Schismatical Congregations. §. 5.

Chap. 2. *Catholicks further affirm,*

5ly. *That, if these Pastors guide unerringly in Necessaries, the People are also to learn from them, what, or how many Points are necessary, so far as the knowledge thereof is necessary to them.* §6.

6ly. *Again; That the Necessaries, wherein these Ecclesiastical Governors are infallible Guides, ought not to be confined to some few points absolutely necessary, but extended to all such points of Faith, as are very beneficial, to Salvation.* §. 9.

7ly. *Concerning the exact distinguishing of necessaries from non-necessaries.*

1. *That, there seems no necessity, that the Church guides should be enabled exactly to distinguish them.* §. 12.

2 *That they may infallibly guide in them, though not infallibly distinguish them.* §14.

3. *That they guiding infallibly in all necessaries (and no distinction of these made) ought to be believed in all points they propose (except an infallible certainty can be shewed of the contrary.* §. 15.

4. *That these Governors do distinguish, and do propose as such, all those more necessary points, which it is requisite for Christians, with a more particular explicite Faith, to believ.* § 17.

8. *That Christians, submitting their judgment to the present Church-Governors in deciding all necessary matters of Faith, ought also to submit it to them, in declaring the sence of the Fathers, or Definitions of Councils, and former Church, concerning the same Matters.* §. 19.

9ly. *That, supposing these Guides to err in some of their Decisions, yet their Subjects, (by the concession of Learned Protestants) ought to yield the Obedience either of silence, or also of assent, to them in all such points, whereof they*

cannot

cannot demonstratively prove the contrary. §. 20.

10. *From whence it follows, that none may adhere to any new Guides; but only so many, as can demonstrate the Errors of the former.* §, 21.

11. *Granted by all; that these Church-Governors may teach diversly; and some of them (more, or fewer) may become erroneous in Necessaries; and miss-guide Christians in them.* §. 22. Chap. 3.

12. *In such dissenting therefore, that there must be some Rule for Christians, which Guides they ought to follow: and that this is, and rationally can be, no other, than, in these Judges subordinate dissenting, to adhere to the Superior; in those of the same Order, and Dignity dissenting, to the major part.* §. 23.

Where,

Of the Major part concluding the Whole, in the ancient Councils. §. 25. *n.* 2. *And,*

Of the Defection of the Church-Prelacy in the time of Arrianisme. §. 26. *n.* 2.

13. *That, accordingly, both in Councils their defining Matters of Religion, and in the Church's acceptation of their Decrees, the much Major part must conclude the whole, and the opposing of their Definitions also be Heresie; and separation from their Communion, Schism; if an Opposition to, or separation from the whole, be so.* §. 27. *n.* 4,

14. *As for the Protestant Marks, whereby, in any Division, to know these true Guides;* [viz. A right teaching of God's Word, and a right Administration of the Sacraments]; *that these are things to be learned from these true Guides first known,* §. 28,

An Application of the former Propositions in a search, which of the opposite present Churches (or of the dissenting Chap. 4.

ing Eccleſiaſtical Governors thereof) *is our true Guide.* §. 30.

Motives perſwading, that the Roman, *and the other* Weſtern *Churches united with it, and with the Head thereof, S.* Peter's *Succeſſor, are this true Guide.*

1st. *Their being the very ſame Body with that, which Proteſtants grant, was* 150 *years ago the Chriſtian's true Guide: and the other Body, confeſsing themſelves, in external Communion, departed from it.* §. 33.

2^ly. *Their being that Body, to which (if we follow the former Rule (recited,* Prop. 12.*) we ought to ſubmit.* §. 35.

3^ly. *Their being that Body, that owns, and adheres to, the Definitions, and Decrees of all the former Councils, ſuch as the Church of preceding Ages, hath received as General, or obliging; as well thoſe Councils ſince, as thoſe before the Sixth, or Seventh Century: which later, the other Party rejects.* §. 37.

Chap. 5. *The pretended Security of thoſe Proteſtants who deny any* certain, *living, or Perſonal Guide, infallible in Neceſſaries; affirming,*

1. *That, all* neceſſary *Matters of Faith are even to the unlearned clear in the Scriptures; and the Controverſies in* non-neceſſaries *needleſſe to be decided.* §. 38.

2. *That, all Neceſſaries are clear in Scripture; becauſe God hath left no other certain Means, Rule, or Guide of the knowledge of them, ſave the Scriptures;* §. 39. *n*, 1.

Not any certain *living Guide,*

1st. *Which is infallible; as their Guide the Scriptures, are.* §. 39. *n.* 2.

2^ly. *Which the unlearned, in any Diviſion, can diſcern,*

cern from the false Guides; or know their Decrees better, than the Scriptures.

3ly. *From whom, the Scriptures direct them, to learn Necessaries; or tell them, what Church, or Party they are to adhere to, in any Schisme made; In which infallible Guide, if there were any such, as being a thing of the greatest concernment, the Scriptures would not have been silent.* Ibid.

Reply.

1. *That, Evidence of the Scriptures hath been the usual Plea of former Hereticks, in their dissenting from the Church.*

2. *That, as to the main and principal Articles of the Christian Faith, the sufficiency of the Rule of Scripture is not denied by* Roman *Catholicks; but only the clearness thereof, as to all mens capacities, questioned. And another Guide held necessary It is replied then.*

I. *Concerning the Clearnesse of Scripture.*

1. *That some Controversies in Religion, since the writing of the Scriptures, have been concerning points necessary; As those Controversies concerning the Trinity; the Deity, and Humanity of our Lord, the necessity of God's Grace,* &c. §. 43.

2. *That, the more clear all Necessaries are in Scripture, still with the more securitie may Christians relie for them on the Church's judgment; from which also they receive these Scriptures.* §. 41.

3. *That, there is no necessity that all Necessaries should be revealed in Scriptures, as to all men, clearly.* §. 41.

1. *Because it is sufficient, if God hath left this one Point clear in Scriptures, that we should, in all difficulties, and Obscurities of them, follow the Directions, and adhere to the Expositions, and Doctrines of these Guides.* §. 41.

2. *Sufficient; if God hath, by other Apostolical Tradi-*

tion

tion at least, clearly revealed to these Church-Guides, all such necessary Truths to be (successively) communicated by them to his people. §. 44.

3. *Sufficient, if God hath, by Tradition, at least clearly revealed to these Church-Guides the sence of such Scriptures as are, in points necessary, any way obscure.* Ibid.

4. *Sufficient, if God, in the Scripture, hath clearly enough revealed all necessary Truths to the capacity of these Church-Guides, using due means, though he hath not to the capacity of the unlearned; for from those, these may learn them.* §. 45.

II. *Concerning a living Guide.*

1. *That, where the Scripture, (especially, several Texts compared) is ambiguous, and in Controversy, the Christians Guide, to know the true sence, cannot be the Scripture, but either the Church's, or their own, judgment.* §. 46. *n.* 1.

2. *That it is not necessary, that God, in the Scriptures, should direct Christians to what Guide they are to repair.* §. 46. n. 2.

Or to what Church-Prelates, or Party, in any Schism, Christians for ever ought to adhere. §. 47. *n.* 2.

3. *Yet, that God hath given Christians a sufficient direction herein, in his leaving a due subordination among these Governors, whereby the Inferiors are subjected to the Superior; and a part unto the whole.* §. 47. *n.* 3.

And, that Christians may more clearly know the sence of their Definitions in matters controverted, than the sence of the Scriptures. §. 48.

THE SECOND DISCOURSE.

CHAP. I.

Protestants assenting. 1. *That there is, at this present, an One, Holy, Catholick, and Apostolick Church,* §. 1. 2. *That the present Pastors and Governours thereof have Authority to decide Controversies,* §. 2. 3. *And that their Governors shall never err or mis-guide Christians, at least in absolute Necessaries,* §. 3. 4. *And that they, with the Church governed by them, do stand always distinct from Heretical, and Schismatical, Congregations,* §. 5.

1st. THat *there is an*, One, Holy, Catholick, Apostolick, *Church, in this Age, and at this present time*; All, I suppose, grant. §. 1. Proposition 1

2ly, *That this* present *Church* (*that is, in its* Pastors, *and* Governors) *is appointed for a* Guide *to Christians, and hath Authority to decide Controversies*, is unquestioned also among several learned Protestants ||; And, I think, is a part of the 20th. Article of the Church of *England*: which Article saith, *The Church hath Authority in Controversies of Faith*: [And what can it mean, but for *deciding* them? or who decide them, but the *Ecclesiastical Governors*?] §. 2. Prop. 2. || See Disc. 1. §. 32, &c.

3ly, *That these* present *Governors, in this present Age, either* * collectively taken, *as they are assembled in a Council, the Decrees whereof are universally accepted by those Governors of the Church diffusive, that are absent from it*; *or* * disjunctively taken, *for some visible Society, or other, of them at least* (*sometimes lesser, sometimes greater*), *shall never misguide Christians, at least in absolute Necessaries to salvation*, is also acknowledged by learned Protestants ||. §. 3. Prop. 3. See Disc. 1. §. 25. &c.

And seems to be the clear sence of the 19th. Article of

the Church of *England*, which affirms—'*The visible Church of*
‖ See Art. 23. *Christ to be a Congregation of faithful men, in the which the* pure *Word of God is preached.* [preached, I suppose by its Ministers] *in all those things, that of* Necessity *are requisite to the same* [Church, or Congregation of the faithful.] And indeed, otherwise, either the first Proposition (a part of our Creed) would be false; because, since the people are obliged to the faith of these their Governors, (*Heb.* 13. 7.——*Eph.* 4. 11. *compared* 14.) the whole Church would thus err in Necessaries, and so would cease to be *Catholick*: Or, at least the Catholick Church in such deficiency of the Clergy, would be constituted wholly of *Laicks*, and of Christs *Sheep* without Pastors, save those, whose Sacraments, and Communion, as falling away from the Catholick Church in Fundamentals are unlawful: which seems very absurd, and contrary to the Promises of our Lord.

Concerning this visible Church, or Society of *Orthodox*-Guides
‖ See 1 Disc. §. 3. thereof never *deficient*, See the Concessions of Dr. *Field* ‖, Dr. *Ferne*, Mr. *Hooker*, and other learned Protestants, in 1. *Disc.* §. 25, &c.

And Mr. *Chillingworth*, though, by reason of the *plainnesse* of *Scripture* in all *Necessaries*, he acknowledgeth no need of any such *Guide*, and therefore denies it ‖: yet thus he, freely, speaks of
‖ P. 59. the necessity of the *Infallibility* of such *Guide*, supposed. '*In* '*Civil Controversies* (saith he) *we are obliged only to external passive obedience, and not to an internal, and active. We are bound to obey the sentence of the Judge, or not to resist it; but not always to believe it just. But, in matters of Religion, such a Judge is required, whom we should be obliged to believe to have judged right. So that in Civil Controversies every honest understanding man is fit to be a Judge: But in Religion none, but he that is infallible.* Thus he. And the reason seems plain; because these are Guides of our souls, and consciences *in matters of belief* for attaining our salvation; but not so the secular, whether our *natural*, or *civil*, Governors, (so that the usual arguing of some Protestants, from the *fallible* authority of the one, its being *sufficient*, to that of the other, seems very faulty); since we have to these no obligation, as concerning *divine matters*, either to *assent* to what they propose, or to *practise* what they command, further, than we believe the thing *true*, they propose, and *lawful*, they command; but are, in case of any doubt in these matters, to repair to these our *spiritual Guides* to be directed, what is *truth*, and *error*; *lawful*, and *unlawful*. The judgment and decision of which things, (so often as the true meaning, and sense of the divine law falls into controversie) those, who do not give to these *Church-Guides*, do, much more dangerously, both for their own souls, and the state

they

they live in, take to *themselves*; for neither do these give the decision of such things to the Civil Magistrates.

§. 5. Prop. 4.

4. Again; It follows likewise from the present being of the Catholick Church of every age; supposed to consist as well of *Clergy* as *People*; *That the present Governors or Guides thereof, who, or where-ever they be, cannot in any age be* Heretical, *or* Schismatical; *for all Heretical, or Schismatical Congregations are contra-distinct both to* [Holy Church] *and* [Catholick Charch], *mentioned in our Creed.*

This is a thing conceded by Archbishop *Lawd*, Dr, *Field* Bishop *Bramhall*, and others. See *Disc.* 1. §. 37, 44.

CHAP. II.

4. *Catholicks, further, affirming.* 5. *That, these Pastors being infallible in Necessaries, the people are to learn from them what is necessary.* §. 6. 6. *That this their Infallibility in Necessaries must extend not only to some few points absolutely necessary, but all others very beneficial, to Salvation.* §, 9. 7. *That it is no way requisite, That these Church-Guides should exactly distinguish all such Necessaries from other points not so.* §: 12. *Which they may, infallibly guide in, though not infallibly separate,* §. 14. *And, no distinction being made, ought to be believed in all they propose.* §. 15. *Yet, that they do both distinguish, and propose as such, all those more necessary points, which it is requisite for all Christians more particularly and explicitly to believe.* §. 17. 8. *That Christians, submitting to their Judgment in deciding Necessaries, ought also to submit to the same, in their declaring the sence of Fathers, Definitions of Councils,* &c. *touching the same matters.* §. 19. 9. *That, supposing these Guides tr err in some of their Decisions, yet their Subjects (by the Concession of Learned Protestants) ought to yield Obedience, either of Silence, or also of Assent, to them in all such points, whereof they cannot demonstratively prove the contrary.* §. 20. 10. *Whence it follows; That, none may adhere to any new Guides, save only those, who can demonstrase the Errors of the former.* §. 21.

§. 6. Prop. 5.

THese things agreed on, 5ly, Catholicks proceed; *That, if there shall be alwaies such a Body of Church-Governors, as*

shall direct the people unerringly in Necessaries, *it is meet also, that Christians learn from them*, what, *or* how many, *points they be, that are necessary* (*if this thing be at all necessary to be known*;).

§. 7. The Reason. 1. Because, if the Church-Guides be infallible in Necessaries; and the distinct knowledge of Necessaries be held also a *Point necessary*, then the Church-Guides must also be infallible in this point, the discerning of Necessaries. 2ly. Because (though Divine assistance be set aside) these *Guides*, from their *Learning*, are fitter Judges of Necessaries, than the *People*, 3ly. Because the *People*, in their judging of Necessaries, if they should (ignorantly, or passionately) *mistake* something, that is necessary, not to be so; and so *withdraw* their Obedience, or assent, may thus become deficient in *necessary* Faith, and so miscarry in their Salvation: Whereas, on the other side, in their reliance, for these points, on the judgment of their Guides, (that are infallible in necessaries), in necessaries they cannot miscarry: and, in their believing something more, as necessary, which is not, their miscarriage is no way dangerous. For, as Dr. *Potter* well observes ‖: *There is not so much danger in adding superfluities, as in detracting Necessaries*; and though these Church-Guides should be supposed liable to miscarry sometimes in the *first*, yet Christians are secured, that they cannot in the *second*.

‖ p. 155.

§. 8. Of the Duty of the Christian's learning from their Guides (supposed infallible in Necessaries) what points are necessary, thus Mr. *Chillingworth* ‖ --*If the Church be an infallible director in Fundamentals, then must we not only learn Fundamentals of her, but also learn of her, what is Fundamental* [i. e. if this be a thing necessary to be learn'd]; *and, take all for fundamental, which she delivers to be such.* [i. e. lest, in doing otherwise, we should mistake, and miscarry in some Fundamental.] And p. 105. ——*To say, the Church is an infallible Guide en Fundamentals, were to oblige our selves to find some certain Society of men, of whom we might be certain, that they neither do, nor can, err in Fundamentals; nor in declaring what is fundamental, what is not fundamental; and consequently, to make any Church an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, would be to make it infallible in all things, which she proposes, and requires to be believed.* [i. e. that she may require our Assent, and Belief of all things, by the device of her proposing them as necessary.].

‖ p. 150.

§. 9. 6ly. When the Church-Guides are said to be infallible in Necessaries, Catholicks contend; Prop. 6. *That*, Necessaries * *ought not to be taken here in so strict a sence, as to be restrained, and limited*

ed only to those few points of Faith, that are so indispensably required to be of all men explicitly *believed, as that* Salvation *is not possibly consistible with the disbelief, or ignorance of any of them; which are thought by the Learned to be only some few Articles of the Apostles Creed.* [Of which see Dr. *Potter*, §. 7. p. 242. &c.] *But* * *ought to be understood in a sence more enlarged, comprehending at least,* * all such Points, *as are so requisite, and beneficial to Salvation, as that there is some danger of a miscarriage therein; either in respect of* Faith, *or* Manners, *either to Particulars, or to the Whole Society; either to all, or at least to some persons, and conditions of men, by the ignorance, or disbelief of them;* * all such Points, *as corroborate Fundamentals by their near connexion to them; or as serve to repel the malignant Influence of some Error, that either directly, or by some consequence at least, undermines, and corrupts, or* (to use the Archbishop's words ||) *grates upon, or miss-expounds,* ||§35.n,5.6 *some* Fundamental, *either in the Christian Faith, or Manners.*

§. 10. 1.

The Reason. 1st. Because our Saviour's promised assistance of his Church is not expressly limited to *Necessaries* in the *first* sence, by any of those Texts that mention it; nor can, upon any account of the superfluousness, or non-necessity of such assistance, be denied to the Church, in respect of the *second*, whereever any *Error* in such points (though they be not Principles, or Fundamentals, but Deductions, and Superstructions) appears to be *gross, dangerous, damnable, blasphemous, idololatrical, grating the Foundation*, &c; which sort of Errors Protestants grant there may be in *non-fundamentals*; and by them are such Errors charged upon the *Church of Rome* ||; but it seems unsutable to our Lord's Love, and everlastiug protection of his deareſt Spouse, that they should be also incident to *the Church Catholick*, or its *supreme Guides*. 2ly. Because the *Practice* of the generally-allowed Primitive Councils defining, and under *Anathema* imposing the belief of many several points of Faith, which fall not under the *first* notion of Necessaries, doth shew; that Church-tradition hath always understood Christ's Promises, made to the Church, as extending to Necessaries in the *second* acception. Neither will infallible assistance in necessaries, as they are taken in the first sense, extend to the *Church-definitions* made in the points delivered in the *Athanasian* Creed; which points yet the Church hath defined as *necessary*, and *infallible*. Again; since it is affirmed by Protestants, that a *Lawful General Council*, accepted by the whole Catholick Church diffusive, may err in *non-necessaries* (for so, say they, may the whole Catholick Church diffusive err ||), if then the Church-definitions, found in the *Athanasian* Creed, are also

|| Arch-bishop *Laud* § 37. n 5.6. — Art. of Rel. 31. — Chill p. 119 2.

:—Stillingf. p. 330.

|| See Archbishop *Laud.* p 139, 140, to 141.

to be reckoned ſuch, *i. e. non-neceſſaries*, upon what account can *Proteſtants* firmly believe them for *true*, (except ſo many as are able to demonſtrate them out of the Scripture,) ſeeing they are deprived of any confidence of the *Church's* not erring therein; as being points reckoned non-neceſſaries? And, the Promiſes thus reſtrained to Neceſſaries of the *firſt* kind, what an hurtful liberty is there left to all *Sects*, to queſtion the Church's Infallibility in many principal Articles of her faith; as (for example) to the *Socinians*, to queſtion it in the point of *Conſubſtantiality*, under this pretence of the Churches poſſibility of erring in non-neceſſaries? 3. 3ly. Becauſe I ſee not, how the title of *Holy*, continued for ever to the Church-Catholick by the Promiſe of our Lord, can conſiſt with all thoſe errors, that yet do oppugne Neceſſaries, only as taken in the ſecond, not firſt, notion: called *groſs*, *dangerous*, *damnable*, *blaſphemous*, &c; if, as theſe are imputed to the *Roman* Church, ſo they may happen, notwithſtanding ſuch *promiſes*, to the *Catholick*. If her *doctrines* (and conſequently *practice*) be ſomtimes damnable, blaſphemous, &c. how *She* always *Holy*? 4. 4. Becauſe, by the ſame *divine aſſiſtance*, the Catholick Church is affirmed by Proteſtants never to fall into *Hereſie*; which thing alſo infers a divine aſſiſtance thereof beyond Neceſſaries in the *firſt* notion; unleſs they will affirm the contradictories of ſeveral of the *Church-definitions* that are delivered in the *Athanaſian* Creed, or the firſt allowed G. Councils, not to be *hereſies*.

§. 11. 5ly. Becauſe, One reaſon which Proteſtants give, why our Lords Promiſe of theſe Guides non-erring is to be reſtrained only to *ſome*, and not enlarged to *all*, Truths, is,* *becauſe they are* by *and* unneceſſary *Truths*, *to which her curioſity or weakneſſe may carry her beyond her Rule*, &c.‖ * *becauſe they are ſuch points, as may be variouſly held, and diſputed* Without hurt *or* prejudice *to faith*——**becauſe they are unprofitable curioſities, and unneceſſary ſubtilties, for which the Promiſe was not made*——**becauſe*, Deus non abundat in ſuperfluis‖: *As natare, ſo God is not laviſh in ſuperfluities*: therefore what points, though not Neceſſaries in the firſt kind, yet are as far removed from *ſuperfluous*, or *curioſities*, and are, though not *abſolutely*, yet *very*, neceſſary ſtill, thus far in theſe we may ſuppoſe our Lords aſſiſtance continued to his Church, and preſerving her from failing in them. ‖A ſecond reaſon, which Proteſtants alſo give, why the Church cannot err in *fundamentals*, is, *the* perſpicuity *of* Scriptures *in theſe Points*. —— *This power of not erring* (ſaith the Arch-biſhop‖) *is in the Church, partly by the vertue of this Promiſe of Chriſt; and partly by the matter which it teacheth; which is the unerring Word of God, ſo plainly,*

‖Arch-biſhop *Laud* p. 141.

‖Dr. *Potter* p. 5. p. 150, &c

‖p. 140.

ly, and manifestly delivered to her, as that it is not possible, she should universally fall from it, or teach against it in things absolutely necessary to salvation. But doubtless many more points there are, as plainly delivered in Scripture, as those Necessaries of the first rank; and therefore no reason to confine her un-erring verdict only to these. And, if more points then the primary fundamentals were not clear in Scripture, how come Protestants, in several of them, on this account of their *clearnesse* in Scriptures, to oppose, and contradict the *Supreme Guides* of the Church.

7ly. Concerning the Church-Governours their exact distinguishing of Fundamentals, or Necessaries from non-Necessaries. §. 12.

Prop. 7. 1st, *There seems no greater necessity,* * *that these Church-Governors should be enabled exactly to distinguish these, as to all particulars: Or* * *that Catholicks should learn such distinction from their Governours; than that Protestants should learn it from the Scriptures. And the Answer which Protestants give, for a non-necessity of this latter;* viz. [Because who believes all the Scripture, believes all Necessaries revealed in it]; *they may take for a non-necessity of the other;* [because who believeth all that the Church defineth, believeth all Necessaries defined by it]; *neither again can the Protestants* justly *require any certainty, explicitness, or distinction of faith, concerning the Proposals of the Church, which distinction, &c. themselves do not maintain, or think necessary, concerning the Proposals, and sence of Scripture.*

So; if the Protestant Divines grant a *sufficient certainty* (as they do)‖ in a Christian's faith, who believes all Fundamentals from the Authority of Scripture; *tho, mean-while, he knows not from the same Scriptures which, or how many they are; nor either the Protestant-Guides, or their followers, out of these Scriptures can make any certain catalogue of them; and * though they also may in the *sense* of many Texts of Scripture, *err*, and mistake; (so that they only build a sufficiency of their faith upon this *hypothetical certainty*; that, if the point be *necessary*, they, using a due industry, cannot *err* in the *sense* of such Scriptures; because all necessaries God hath, in these Scriptures, clearly revealed,) Then they cannot deny the same *sufficient certainty* of a Catholicks faith, that believes all fundamentals from the Proposal of his *Ecclesiastical Guides*, if these Guides be granted in these infallible; tho', neither he, nor these Guides, should certainly know, for all points, *which*, or *how many* these fundamentals be.

‖ See Mr. *Chillingw.* p. 160.

Very vain therefore seems that discourse of Mr. *Chillingworth* c. 3. §. 57. so far as it is made use of to this purpose; to shew, §. 13.

upon

upon the non-distinction of fundamentals, or the supposed liability of Church-Guides to err in non-fundamentals, the *uncertainty* or unsufficiency of a *Catholicks* faith: As also ridiculous that arguing of his; where, when Catholicks say, they are certain, concerning every particular point proposed by the Church, that, if it be a fundamental, she errs not in it, [*i.e.* errs not, in what she determines concerning it; or errs not in determining any thing against it] He saith, *They say, that they are certain, that if it be a* fundamental truth, *the Church doth not err in it* [i. e. in holding it]: *Which* (saith he) *is in plain English to say; you are certain, it is true; if it be both true, and necessary.*

§. 14. 2ly, *Neither doth it follow from these Church-Guide's supposed inability exactly to distinguish Necessaries from non-Necessaries, that therefore they are, or can be, no infallible Guide in all Necessaries; that is, in teaching, and prescribing them, though they should not be so in distinguishing them, and in their teaching nothing, besides, together with, them.*

[p.105,150. Nor is that consequence of Mr. *Chillingworth's* ‖ true, *That if there be a Society of men infallible in Fundamentals, they must be so also, in* declaring *what is Fundamental, or necessary, what not*; unless upon this supposition, that the *declaring* thereof is also a thing *Necessary* (as I suppose he meant it.) For I may be certainly, by the divine goodness, preserved from error in many *truths*, which yet I do not certainly know, that they are truths; And again further; may certainly know something to be a truth, and teach it to others; and yet not further know it to be a truth so *absolutely necessary*, as perhaps it is. To use Mr. *Chillingworths* [p.159. *simile* ‖: *A Physician, in his using of a medicine consisting of twenty Ingredients, of which medicine he is certain, that the Whole receit hath in it all things necessary to the cure of such a disease, yet may not exactly know, whether all the Ingredients thereof are absolutely necessary, or only some of them necessary, the rest only profitable, and requisite* ad melius esse; *or some only necessary, some profitable, and the rest superfluous, yet not hurtful*; As also the Protestants grant, that the Church, in delivering the Scriptures, delivers all *necessary truths* therein, yet without punctually knowing *what*, or *how many* they are.

§. 15. 3. 3ly. *It seems most reasonable; that a Guide, of whose not erring in Necessaries, I am secure. But neither I, nor it, can exactly distinguish such from non-Necessaries, should be believed by me in all it proposeth, though in some Proposals it should be liable to error.*

I must add one exception indeed: If that in no particular, which it proposeth, I am *infallibly certain* of the *contrary*; for then,

in

in such, I am sure, that the Tenent of this Guide can be no *fundamental Truth*, because not *truth*. But first; this Exception is unserviceable to all those (which are the most) as can plead no such infallible certainty; for so many stand obliged still to the former belief. 2ly, such exception can, *rationally*, be made use of by none, in the matters we speak of; for who can presume himself thus certain in a matter of faith, or in his own *sense of* Scripture (though the *literal* expression be never so clear), where so many learned, and his Superiors, (comparing other texts, &c.) understand it otherwise, and are of a contrary judgment? For, it is the same, as if, in a matter of sense, a dim-sighted person should professe himself certain, that an object is white, when a multitude of others, the most clear-sighted that can be found, having all the same means, with him, of a right sensation, pronounce it black, or of another colour.

§. 16.

Now, this case only excepted, I say, such Guide ought to be believed by me in all it proposeth. And this upon a triple account. 1st, because otherwise I expose my self to error in something necessary; to which error, in not following this Guide, I am very liable; for, though, I have, besides this Guide, a *Rule* infallible; yet my *sence* thereof is not so, in points that are controverted. 2ly, because this is such a Guide, as learned Protestants grant, that Gods Command doth oblige me, *to obey* its judgment, where I have no *certain evidence* of the *contrary* of its decrees||. And also *common reason* obligeth me to follow a *better* judgment, than my own; especially when I do it, as with due humility, so with sufficient safety; because thus it must be only a *non-Necessary*, that I can err in: and as I am certain, if a *fundamental*, that it is *true*, what it delivers; so not certain, if it be no fundamental, that then it is not true. 3ly, because, though something superfluous may possibly be determined by this Guide, yet, considering the former notion of Necessaries||, (to which, there seems good cause, that the infallibility of this Guide be extended), who will undertake to exclude any *particular* Church-definition from being, in some of the fore-named respects, *necessary*? especially when he must do this against better Judgments; whilst these Guides, consulted about any particular decrees of theirs, will never professe, or grant to him, to have passed it, but as thought, in respect of some times, places, or persons; Christian-faith, or manners; edification of particulars, or Government of the Church, *necessary*. This concerning the reasonableness of believing in *all points*, those, who are infallible in *all Necessaries*.

|| See below §. 20.

|| §. 9.

2ly.

§. 17. 4. 4ly, Though these *Church-Guides* should be granted not to be enabled, by the *divine assistance*, so far, as to distinguish *exactly* Necessaries, from non-Necessaries in *all* points, so that nothing should be redundant in their definitions, or proposals: Yet it seems rationally concluded, *That they are always so far divinely assisted, not only in their* decisions, *not to err in Necessaries; but also, in their* judgment, *to discern, and distinguish them from others, not necessary to be so much pressed; and, in their* diligence, *to propose them, as that they shall never fail in the* discerning, *or* proposing (*in their Creeds, Catechisms, and other publike teaching*) *all more* absolute *necessaries, or all points requisite to be* explicitly *believed*; (*for all things defined are not necessary to be* by all known, or to all taught): never fail in proposing these, *I say, so clearly and entirely to all the Subjects of the Church, even the unlearned, as that none can be ignorant thereof, without his neglect to hearken to such a sufficient Proposal; which is, in all times, made by the Church.*

§. 18. The Reason of this *Indeficiency* of Church-Guides in the *Proposal* of such Necessaries, is: Because it seems most just, and is on all sides accorded; that all Necessaries, wherein an explicite faith is required of all Christians, should be to them, by some means or other, sufficiently proposed. And then; the dispute, concerning this sufficient *Proponent*, lying between the *Scriptures*, and the *Church* (for what other external Proponent can be devised?) of these two, as to several of these Points, the latter must be *it*. 1st, Because experience shews, the *sense* of Scripture not evident to all in many great Articles of faith; which Articles yet are cleared by the Church-Guides||. So that, tho' it be true, which Mr. *Chillingworth* saith||, *That he who believes* all *that is* Scripture, *believes* all Necessaries: yet so it is, that in many places of Scripture, and that about points thought necessary, when variously interpreted, many (unlearned especially) know not what to believe for the *Scripture-sence* in such places; and thus fail in the *explicit* belief, * of some part of Scripture, and so perhaps, * of some Necessaries in it. 2ly, Because before the penning of the New-Testament-Scriptures this office of the *Proposal* of all *divine necessary* truths to the people, belonged to the *Church-Guides*, to *Timothy*, *Titus*, and others. Nor seems their *authority*, by the writing of the Christian faith, diminished; by which Writings also they are still more enabled compleatly to perform their former duty. 3ly Because these Scriptures also refer us, in controversies, and in learning our faith, to the direction of these *Guides*. See §.3. 4ly, Because the *illiterate* within the Church-Catholick, to whom also God is not deficient in the revelation

|| Stillingf. p.58,59. || p.18.160, 164.

lation of all *necessary* faith, cannot have *this* from *Writings*; but must receive it from their *Guides*, and *Pastors*: as also they did in all those times before Christ, when the Holy Scriptures remained only in the hands of the learned; or also, before any of them were penned.

§. 19. Prop. 8.

18. If we ought to submit our judgments to these present guides, in their deciding what are necessary matters of Faith, according to the fifth Proposition preceding‖; it seems reasonable, *that so we ought also to submit* * *in their* expounding *all former* Writings *concerning the same matters, that are pretended any way* ambiguous, *and so cannot end the Controversie, made about their sense; whether these be the Writings of the* Scriptures; *or* Fathers; *or former* Councils *of the Church. And also* × *in their declaring Which of former Councils are* Legal, *and Obligatory:*

‖ See §. 6.

So that the ultimate determination of doubts, * concerning all *former Determinations*, and Definitions of former Church in such matters of necessary Faith (as well as * concerning *new questions*) when Controversie is raised in them, ought to be referred to these *present Judges*; and their determinations hereupon, so far as we can have them, to be peaceably acquiesced in. For, if we ought to receive all, that they deliver to us as matters of *necessary Faith*; we ought also, and may *as securely*, credit them, when declaring, what in these Necessaries was the *Faith* of their *Predecessors.*

§. 20. Prop. 9.

9ly. Protestants also agree: *that, though these Guides may erre in some Points* not necessary, *yet their Subjects ought to yield their* silence, *and by no means to* contradict *them*; *or* (*as some more judicious Protestants do yield yet further*) *ought to submit their* Judgments *also, and yield their* Assent *to them, even in those Definitions, wherein these Guides are liable to Error, whenever, not these Guides do prove to them their Conclusions* (*so much is thought unreasonably exacted*) *but when their Subjects cannot demonstratively prove the contrary.*

In this matter thus Dr. *Jackson*, in stating the Question: whether the Injunction of publick Ecclesiastical authority may oversway any degree of our private perswasion, concerning the unlawfulness of any Opinion, or action ‖. ——*It is most evident* (saith he ‖) *from the former places alledged* ‖ *concerning the Commission of Priests, and Ministers, that the lawful Pastor, or Spiritual Overseer, hath as absolute authority to demand Belief, or Obedience, in Christ's; as any Civil Magistrate hath to demand Temporal Obedience, in the State, or Prince's Name.* ——And ——*Our*

‖ On the Creed, *l.* 2. § 1. *c.* 5.
‖ *Ibid. c.* 6.
‖ Eph 4.11. -Heb. 13.17. -Luk. 10.16. -Ioh. 20.23. *Ib.*

O. r. Itself wile

§. 17. 4. 4ly, Though these *Church-Guides* should be granted not to be enabled, by the *divine assistance*, so far, as to distinguish *exactly* Necessaries, from non-Necessaries in *all* points, so that nothing should be redundant in their definitions, or proposals: Yet it seems rationally concluded, *That they are always so far divinely assisted, not only in their* decisions, *not to err in Necessaries; but also, in their* judgment, *to discern, and distinguish them from others, not necessary to be so much pressed; and, in their* diligence, *to propose them, as that they shall never fail in the* discerning, *or* proposing (*in their Creeds, Catechisms, and other publike teaching*) *all more* absolute *necessaries, or all points requisite to be* explicitly *believed*; (*for all things defined are not necessary to be* by all known, or to all taught): never fail in proposing these, *I say, so clearly and entirely to all the Subjects of the Church, even the unlearned, as that none can be ignorant thereof, without his neglect to hearken to such a sufficient Proposal; which is, in all times, made by the Church.*

§. 18. The Reason of this *Indeficiency* of Church-Guides in the *Proposal* of such Necessaries, is: Because it seems most just, and is on all sides accorded; that all Necessaries, wherein an explicite faith is required of all Christians, should be to them, by some means or other, sufficiently proposed. And then; the dispute, concerning this sufficient *Proponent*, lying between the *Scriptures*, and the *Church* (for what other external Proponent can be devised?) of these two, as to several of these Points, the latter must be *it*. 1st, Because experience shews, the *sense* of Scripture not evident to all in many great Articles of faith; which Articles yet are cleared by the Church-Guides‖. So that, tho' it be true, which Mr. *Chillingworth* saith‖, *That he who believes* all *that is* Scripture, *believes* all Necessaries: yet so it is, that in many places of Scripture, and that about points thought necessary, when variously interpreted, many (unlearned especially) know not what to believe for the *Scripture-sence* in such places; and thus fail in the *explicit* belief, * of some part of Scripture, and so perhaps, * of some Necessaries in it. 2ly, Because before the penning of the New-Testament-Scriptures this office of the *Proposal* of all *divine necessary* truths to the people, belonged to the *Church-Guides*, to *Timothy*, *Titus*, and others. Nor seems their *authority*, by the writing of the Christian faith, diminished; by which Writings also they are still more enabled compleatly to perform their former duty. 3ly Because these Scriptures also refer us, in controversies, and in learning our faith, to the direction of these *Guides*. See §.3. 4ly, Because the *illiterate* within the Church-Catholick, to whom also God is not deficient in the revelation

‖ Stillingf. P.58,59. ‖ P.18.160, 164.

lation of all *necessary* faith, cannot have *this* from *Writings*; but must receive it from their *Guides*, and *Pastors*: as also they did in all those times before Christ, when the Holy Scriptures remained only in the hands of the learned; or also, before any of them were penned.

§. 19. Prop. 8.

18. If we ought to submit our judgments to these present guides, in their deciding what are necessary matters of Faith, according to the fifth Proposition preceding‖; it seems reasonable, *that so we ought also to submit* * *in their* expounding *all former* Writings *concerning the same matters, that are pretended any way* ambiguous, *and so cannot end the Controversie, made about their sense; whether these be the Writings of the* Scriptures; *or* Fathers; *or former* Councils *of the Church. And also* * *in their declaring Which of former Councils are* Legal, *and Obligatory:*

‖ See §. 6.

So that the ultimate determination of doubts, * concerning all *former Determinations*, and Definitions of former Church in such matters of necessary Faith (as well as * concerning *new questions*) when Controversie is raised in them, ought to be referred to these *present Judges*; and their determinations hereupon, so far as we can have them, to be peaceably acquiesced in. For, if we ought to receive all, that they deliver to us as matters of *necessary Faith*; we ought also, and may *as securely*, credit them, when declaring, what in these Necessaries was the *Faith* of their *Predecessors*.

§. 20. Prop. 9.

9ly. Protestants also agree: *that, though these Guides may erre in some Points* not necessary, *yet their Subjects ought to yield their* silence, *and by no means to* contradict *them*; *or* (*as some more judicious Protestants do yield yet further*) *ought to submit their* Judgments *also, and yield their* Assent *to them, even in those Definitions, wherein these Guides are liable to Error, whenever, not these Guides do prove to them their Conclusions* (*so much is thought unreasonably exacted*) *but when their Subjects cannot demonstratively prove the contrary.*

In this matter thus Dr. *Jackson*, in stating the Question: whether the Injunction of publick Ecclesiastical authority may oversway any degree of our private perswasion, concerning the unlawfulness of any Opinion, or action ‖. ——*It is most evident* (saith he ‖) *from the former places alledged* ‖ *concerning the Commission of Priests, and Ministers, that the lawful Pastor, or Spiritual Overseer, hath as absolute authority to demand Belief, or Obedience, in Christ's; as any Civil Magistrate hath to demand Temporal Obedience, in the State, or Prince's Name.* ——And ——*Our*

‖ On the Creed, *l.* 2. § 1. *c.* 5.
‖ *Ibid.* c. 6.
‖ Eph 4.11. -Heb. 13.17. -Luk. 10.16. -Ioh. 20.23. *Ib.* 1.

Disobedience [i. e. Dissent, or non-submission of Judgment] *is unwarrantable, unlesse we can truly derive some formal contradiction, or opposition, between the injunction of Superiors, and expres Law of the most High.*——*Every Doubt, or Scruple that the Church's Edicts are directly, or formally contrary to God's Law, is not sufficient to deny Obedience.*——Again. *We may not put the Superior to prove what he commands, but he is to be obeyed, till we can* prove *the* contrary.——*If Pastors are only to be obeyed, when bringing evidence out of Scripture, what Obedience perform we to them more, than to any other man whatsoever? For whosoever shews the expres undoubted Command of God, it must be obeyed of all. If we thus only bound to obey, then I am not more bound to obey any other man, than he bound to obey, or believe me: The Flock no more bound to obey the Pastor, than the Pastor them: And so the donation of spiritual Authority, when Christ ascended on high, were a donation of meer Titles,* This he, this others ||. and in reason, what can any say lesse?

|| Hooker Pref. §. 6.-- l. 2. §. 7.

§. 21. Prop. 10.

10'y. From this I also take it for granted; *That, though such or so many, as can demonstratively* prove *the contrary, are hereby disobliged to yield their Assent to the Doctrines of their* former Guides: *yet so many others as cannot do the like, remain obliged still to follow, and obey the same, their former, Pastors; and by no means may join themselves in communion, or adhere, to the new* Demonstrators, *till they themselves are confirmed in the like Certainty.*

By which Rule, how few will there be of the Reformed, that do not still owe their Obedience to the same Church (giving her Laws still as formerly), that was before *Luther*, (who upon new Evidences, deserted it), where all owe this Obedience, save *Demonstrators* of their *new* Tenents?

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

11. *That these Church-Governors may teach diversly; and some of them err in Necessaries, and fall into Heresies.* § 22. 12. *And therefore Christians not left to follow, whom of them they please: But some certain Rule there is, to which of them, in any Division, they ought to adhere. That this, in the universal Church-practice, is, and rationally can be, no other; than, in these Judges subordinate dissenting, to adhere to the Superior; in those of the same Order, and Dignity, dissenting, to the Major part.* §. 23. &c. *Where, Of the Major part concluding the whole in the ancient Councils.* §. 25. n. 2. *And, Of the Defection of the Church-Prelacy in the times of* Arrianism. §. 26. n. 2. 14. *And that the Protestant-Marks whereby to discern true from false Guides, as to the Quest here,* (viz. *to learn from these true Guides, in matters controverted, which is the true Faith*) *are unserviceable.* §. 28.

§. 22. Prop. 11.

11ly. THat some *of these Church-Governors (more, or fewer) may become* Hereticks, *and erroneous in points necessary; and may guide Christians contrary to the rest of them,* is granted by all sides, and known by Experience.

§. 23. Prop. 12.

12ly. It seems therefore also evident: *That, Christians, (for yielding the Obediences, forenamed,* Propos. 9th. *and allowed by Protestants) in such* dissenting *of* Governors, *may not safely follow, which of them they please, or judge to be, in their doctrines, the righteſt; (for so they judge of their* Judges, *and may as well judge the* Controversies); *but, that some* Rule *there is, to whom, in such case, they are to adhere; whom to relinquish (it being as necessary, for the same divine providence, to leave some means, by which to know* our Guide, *as to give us one.) And this Rule also by tradition hath been, and in reason can be, no other, but that, in Judges Ecclesiastical subordinate (whether* Persons, *or* Councils) *dissenting, men ought to adhere to the* Superior; *in Judges equal dissenting, to adhere to the* Major, *not minor, part.* For Example. In *England* a Synod Diocesan, and one compounded of both the Provinces, dissenting, here Obedience is due to the *Provincial* Synod, or Convocation; and, in the Provincial Synod again, a minor part dissenting, due to the *Major*. Otherwise

any may hold what doctrine liketh him beſt, and oppoſe the maintainers of the contrary; ſince ordinarily, ſome Eccleſiaſtical Governor, either *Inferior*, or *Superior*; if not a *greater*, yet ſome *ſmaller* part, or other of them, may be found alſo to hold it. And thus the Unity of this Catholick Church, as to doctrine, is quite overthrown.

§. 24. n. 1. 1. 1ſt. *In Perſons, or Councils, ſubordinate*, that the *Superior*, in caſe of any diſſent, rightly challengeth our Obedience, I think it out of diſpute. So, in *England*, for the eſtabliſhing of the authority of the ſupreme *National* Synod, and the Obedience thereto, in reſpect of all Inferiors, for preventing diſſentions, ſee the Decree in *Can.* 139. & 140. of the Synod under K. *James.* 1603. Where it is ſaid,——*Whoſoever ſhall affirm, that the Sacred Synod of this Nation is not the true Church of* England *by repreſentation.*——*Or ſhall affirm, that no manner of perſon, either of the Clergy, or Laity, not being themſelves particularly aſſembled in the ſaid Sacred Synod, are to be ſubject to the Decrees thereof in cauſes Eccleſiaſtical, as not having given their voices unto thoſe Decrees, let him be excommunicated, and not reſtored, until he repent, and publickly revoke that his wicked Error.* And, for Obedience to this *Higheſt Eccleſiaſtical Court*, ſee the *King's* reſolute Speech in the Conference at *Hampton-Court* ‖.——*I will have one Doctrine, and one Diſcipline; one Religion in ſubſtance, and Ceremony; and therefore I charge you never to ſpeak more to that point (How far you are bound to obey?) when the Church hath ordained it.* [What Subjection then, for preſerving Unity, is required in the *Engliſh* Church, cannot reaſonably be diſallowed by them in the *Catholick.*] Again, ſee in Dr. *Hammond's* Book of Schiſm ‖ an acknowledgment of primitive Subordination, as of a *Presbyter* to the *Biſhop*; ſo of *Biſhops* to *Metropolitans*; of *Metropolitans* to *Primates*, or *Patriarchs*; where he comes ſhort but one Link of thoſe which the *Roman* Church maintains, *viz.* Of the *Patriarchs* to the *Proto-Patriarch*, or the Biſhop of *Rome.* And again, ſee his acknowledgment ‖ *of a Subordination of all theſe* ſevered *perſons to the whole Corporation, or Body of them* aſſembled *in Council.* (*in which Council, he ſaith, It is evident, that the power which ſeverally belongs to each Biſhop, is there united.*) [I add, and therefore if that Power which they have ſeverally, be by divine right, ſo is this, which they have conjunctly, notwithſtanding what is diſputed againſt it ‖]: *as a ſubordination of all the* Biſhops *in a Province, to a Council Provincial; in a Nation to a Council National; of all Chriſtianity, to a Council General.* Only here he omits

p. 72.

c. 3.

‖ Schiſm. c 8. p 158-Anſ. to Cath. Gentl. p. 29.

‖ Anſw. to Cath. Gentl. p. 29. §. 9, 10.

‖ See *Stil.* Rat account 3 par. c. 1. p. 515. &c.

one

one subordination well known in the Church, and sufficiently attested by other Protestants, *viz.* a subordination of the Bishops of several Nations that are under one *Patriarch*, to a Council *Patriarchal*.

Which defect of his give me leave to supply to you out of Dr. *Field*, and Bishop *Bramhall*, Authorities as authentick as his. Thus then Dr. *Field*‖, ——*These Patriarchs might convocate the Metropolitans of their several divisions, and hold a Patriarchal Council, which was of greater Authority, then either those in the several Provinces, or of a whole Nation, formerly mentioned; because it consisted of more, and more honourable, Bishops: yet had the Patriarchs no greater authority over the Metropolitans within their larger Circuits, than the Metropolitans within their lesser Compass.* And (*Ib.*513.) shewing, against *Bellarmine*, that, by reason of the several *subordinations* of the Churches *Officers*, and of their *Consults*, there was no further necessity of a Monarchical Government in the Church, for conserving the unity thereof.—— 1 *If* (saith he) *a Synod consisted of the Metropolitans, and Bishops of one Kingdom, or State only, the chief Primate was Moderator*; 2 *If of many* [Kingdoms] *one of the Patriarchs, and chief Bishops of the Whole World* [was Moderator]: *Every Church*, [and therefore this of *England*, as to Ecclesiastical Government] *being subordinate to some one of the Patriarchal Churches, and incorporate into the unity of it.* 3 *Thirdly, the Actions of a Whole Patriarchship were subject to a Synod Oecumenical.* And elsewhere he saith‖,——*That the Patriarch of the West may call a Council of the Western Bishops, lawfully punishing those, who obey not his summons; and he and the Council so assembled, may make Decrees which shall be obligatory to all the Western Church.* And, thus Bishop *Bramhall*‖, *What power the Metropolitan had over the Bishop of his own Province, the same had a Patriarch over the Metropolitans, and Bishops of sundry Provinces, within his own Patriarchate.* ——And afterward ——*Wherein then consisted Patriarchal Authority? in ordaining their Metropolitans (for with inferior Bishops they might not meddle) or confirming them, in imposing of hands, or giving the Pall; in convocating Patriarchal Synods; and presiding in them, &c, When Metropolitical Synods did not suffice to determine some emergent differences, or difficulties.* So in Schism-guarded p.349. he saith, ——*That the Ecclesiastical Head of the Church is a General Council; and under that each Patriarch in his Patriarchate; and among the Patriarchs, the Bishop of* Rome, *by a Priority of Order.* And see *Ibid. p.4.* his allowing this Bishop to be *Exordium Unitatis.* This of the subordination

‖ Of the Ch. p. 518.

‖ l.5. c. 30. p. 513.

‖ l.5. c. 52. p. 668.

‖ Vindic. of the Ch. of *England*. P. 257.

p. add. ad. p. 364.

of

of the Bishops of several Nations to a Council Patriarchal, taken out of others, because omitted by Dr. *Hammond*.

Above which, the next and highest subordination is, that of *all* the Bishops in Christianity to a *Council General*. To which *General Council* this Doctor thus professeth elsewhere || the due subjection of the Church of *England*:— *Upon the strength of this perswasion* (saith he) *that God will never permit any such universal testimony concerning the faith to conspire in conveying error to us, as we have never yet opposed* [*never opposed*, that implies obedience of Silence; but, upon the former perswasion, I see not, why he should not say, *never dissented from*] *any universal Council, nor other voice of the whole Church, such as, by the Catholick Rules, can be contested to be such; so, for the future, we professe never to do.*— And on 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *The Church is the Pillar and Ground of truth*, he comments thus. *According to this it is, that Christ is said* (Eph. 4. 11.) to have given not only Apostles, &c. but also Pastors, and Teachers (i.e. *the Bishops in the Church*) *for the compacting of the Saints into a Church, for the continuing them in all truth, that we should be no longer, like children, carried about with every Wind of doctrine. And so again, when heresies came into the Church in the first Ages, it is every where apparent by* Ignatius's *Epistles, That the only way of avoiding error and danger, was to adhere to the Bishop in communion, and doctrine; and whosoever departed from him, and that forme of wholesom words kept by him, was supposed to be corrupted.*— And the same also (to *S. W.* objecting, *That it availed not for freedom from Schism, to adhere to the Authority of our Bishop* (*as the Arrians did*) *if such Bishop hath rejected the authority of his Superiors, and taught contrary to them*) He grants || concerning any Bishops, and those adhering to them, if departing from their Superiors,—*That retaining the Authority of their Bishops is not, being taken alone, any certain Argument or Evidence of not being schismaticks, &c.* This he, for establishing such Church-authority, and the due subordinations thereof; from any of which (whether person or Council) a voluntary departure of those, who are subordinate||, or also a wilful continuance under their censures laid upon them ||, is by him declared *Schism*.

'Of which *Schism* he speaks thus, || *First*, (saith he) *those 'Brethren, or* People, *which reject the Ministry of the* Deacons, 'or Presbyters *in any thing, wherein they are ordained, and appointed by the Bishop, (and as long as they continue in obedience to him), 'and of their own accord do break off and separate from them, refuse 'to live regularly under them, they are by the ancient Church of Christ 'adjudged*

|| Of Heresie. §. 11. p. 149.

|| Schism disarm. p. 255.

|| Answ. to Schism disarm p. 261.

|| Of Schism, c. 3. — Answ. to C. Gentlem. p. 30

|| Answ. to C. Gent. p. 9. §. 4.

§. 24. n. 2.

|| Of Schism, p. 34.

'*adjudged and looked on as Schismaticks*. [Here then are many late Sects among Protestants rejecting the Clergy, (I know not well by what name to call them, confessed guilty of Schism] —— *In like manner* (saith he‖), *if we ascend to the next higher link, that* ‖ P. 37. 41. *of the* Bishop, *to whom both* Presbyters, *and* Deacons, *as well as the* 'Brethren, *or* People *are obliged to live in* obedience, *the with-* 'drawing, *or denying this obedience in any of these will certainly fall* 'under this guilt.—*And, as this obedience may be of two sorts, ei-* 'ther *of a lower, or of a higher kind; (the denying obedience in any* 'particular *lawful command of the Superior, or the casting off all o-* 'bedience *together; dethroning them, or setting up our selves either* 'in *their steads, or in opposition to them,) so will the* Schism *be also a* 'lighter, *and a grosser separation*. [And here are all Protestant, *Pres-* 'byterial, whether *Persons*, or *Churches*, (for any thing I can un- 'derstand) opposing Episcopacy, or setling instead of it a Pres- 'byterial Church-Government, confessed also by him guilty of '*Schism*; of Schism, I mean from their *spiritual Superiors*; wher- 'by also they becom no members of the Church-Catholick (which 'Church-Catholick stands always contradistinct to Heretical, and 'Schismatical Churches): nor are any such Schismaticks (known 'to be so, and not recanting such their Schism) to be admitted to 'enjoy the communion of the Presbytery of any Church, that 'professeth it self a member of the Catholick. Which thing will '1st, cut off no small body of the Protestants from the Catholick 'Church; And 2ly. will render, in some manner, partaker of 'their guilt, any other Protestant-Clergy that shall communicate '(knowingly) with them] The same sentence upon the Presby- 'terians deserting their Bishops, that is, their spiritual Superiors, 'pronounceth Dr. *Ferne*, ——*They have insurred* (saith he) *by lea-* ‖ The Case 'ving *us, (and I wish they would sadly consider it) no less then the* between *Eng.* 'guilt *of* Schism, *which lies heavily on as many, as have (of what* and *Rome*. P. 'persuasion *or sect soever,) wilfully divided themselves from the* 46, 48. 'Communion *of the* Church *of* England, *whether they do this by* 'a *bare separation, or by adding violence, and sacrilege to it.* For 'making *good* (saith he) *this charge of Schism against them, we will* 'premise *some undeniable truths, which speak the Authority of* 'Church *Governors, the obedience due thereunto, the condition of* 'Schism, *and the danger, and guilt of it. The first is, that the* 'Church *of Christ is a Society*, or Company *under a Regiment, dis-* 'cipline, *Government; and the members constituting that Society are* 'either *persons taught, guided, governed, or persons teaching, guide-* 'ing, *governing, and this in order to preserve all in unity, and to ad-* 'vance *every member of this visible Society, to an effectual and real*

par-

'participation of *Grace, and Union with Christ the Head; and there-*
'*fore, and upon no less account, is obedience due unto them,* (Eph. 4.
'11, 12, 13, 16 *and* Heb. 13. 17.) *and he that will not hear the Church,*
'*to be as a Heathen, and Publican,* Mat. 16. &c. Thus he. And
'thus clear-sighted men are in the case where they are to require
'obedience; but not so, where to yield it. This said of the
'Schism of Presbyters departing from their Bishops; the same
‖ of Schism, c. 3. 'Dr. *Hammond* saith ‖ of the Schism of *Bishops* departing from
'their *Metropolitans*, and of Metropolitans from their *Primats*
'or Patriarchs. Now to go on.]

If then (for example) the Presbyter is bound upon such a guilt, to obey his Bishop, then the subjects of both the Presbyter and the Bishop, when these two dissent, are tied to adhere to the Bishop, not to the Presbyter: *i.e.* to obey him, whom the other, if he continued in his duty, ought also to obey; and *sic de cæteris.* These *subordinations* therefore known, Christians also cannot but know, in the division of Church-Governors, distinct in dignity, still those, to whom their obedience is thus fastned.

V. add. ad p. 365.

§. 25. n. 1. 2. 2. Next, *In a Body, or Court, consisting of many of an equal rank;* (as Councils, the supreme Ecclesiastical Judge, do) in which body, in all, or most causes, or decisions, may, and usually do happen some dissenters, that here it is necessary for rending the decrees of such complex bodies effectual, that at least *the much major part* thereof joyned with the prime Apostolick See conclude the whole, the *traditionary practice* of the most universally allowed Councils, from the beginning of Christianity (as likewise the same *practice* in all Civil Courts of the same composition) doth sufficiently put this out of dispute, if any thing can be so. See what is said of this. *Disc.* 1. §. 31, 36, 38.

Where, if it be further demanded, for legitimating the Acts of such a Council, or also for the sufficient acceptation, by the Church Catholick, of such act, or definition, what *proportion* this *major* part, whether defining in Council, or accepting out of it, is to bear in respect of the *minor*, or how much to exceed it; I know not, what better director herein we can have, than the former custom of the *Catholick* Church, and the example, and pattern of the *primitive* times; Nor what greater justification the proceedings of *later* Councils can receive herein, than the same practice, as theirs is, appearing in those ancient Councils, that are universally allowed.

§. 25. n. 2. ['If then we stay here a litle to review the proceedings,

of

'of the *firſt* Councils, and think the later times may ſafely ſteer 'according to their courſe. Looking into the firſt Council of 'Nice; we find, in *Hilarius*‖, no leſs then eighty Biſhops, before 'this Council was aſſembled, mentioned to have diſallowed the 'reception of the word ὁμόσιος; (See alſo what Biſhops, *Arius* 'pretended, to have ſided with him, in his Letter to *Euſeb. Nico-* 'med. written ſome years before the *Nicene* Council‖); and, in 'the Council alſo,* ſeventeen Biſhops (ſome of note) at the firſt to 'have diſſented from the reſt; and, after the Council, * Arianiſm, 'in the Eaſtern parts, to have grown, in a ſmall time, to a much 'greater bulk, (ſupporting their cauſe with ſeveral unwary ex- 'preſſions of former Eccleſiaſtical Writers, as *Juſtin Martyr, Ire-* 'næus, *Tertullian, Clemens Alexand. Origen*,‖ before a ſtricter diſ- 'cuſſion of this controverſie.) Yet was this no diminution to 'the ſtrength of the *Nicene* decree, or to a valid acceptation 'thereof, both being done by a *much greater* part of the 'Church.

‖ De Synodis

‖ Apud Epiph. Hær. 69. Theodoret. l. 1. c. 5.

‖ See Pelavius in Epiph. Her. 69.

'Again in the third General Council of *Epheſus*, we find *John* §. 25. n. 3. the Patriarch of *Antioch* with his Oriental Biſhops (above thir- 'ty) favouring *Neſtorianiſm*, and oppoſing the decrees of the 'reſt of that Council; yet did not the other part of that Coun- 'cil forbear to define *Anti-Neſtorianiſm without*, and *againſt* 'them, and alſo to excommunicate them for their non-conformi- 'ty to the *major part*; nor did the Chriſtian world ceaſe to ac- 'count the acts of this Council valid, without the acceptation 'thereof by this Patriarch, and his party, theſe acts being juſti- 'fied by the *much greater* part of the Church Catholick, joyned 'with the Roman Patriarch. Neither ſuppoſing that this Pa- 'triarch, and his Biſhops, and their Succeſſors had continued to 'this day, (as too many ever ſince in thoſe parts do, and as they 'did for ſome time) to oppoſe this decree, could it have reſcued 'Neſtorianiſm from being juſtly reputed an *Hereſie*; though this 'party was ſo conſiderable, as that the Emperour retarded the 'Execution of the Councils cenſures upon them, till that, in the 'year next enſuing, the Patriarch, and moſt of the reſt were re- 'gained to a peaceable ſubmiſſion to the Church Catholick and 'her doctrine.

'Come we to the fourth General Council of *Chalcedon*. Two §. 25. n. 4. 'years before it, in a queſtion concerning our *Lord's* conſiſting 'of, and in, *two natures* diſtinct, not only before, but after, their 'union in *one perſon*, the prevalent party in a Council of above '120 Biſhops had defined the contrary, *tanquam de fide*; For which 'alſo they pretended the doctrine of the Fathers, *Athanaſius, Cyril*,

'ril *Alexand.* and *Gregory Nazianz.* Concerning which Fa-
'thers you may find *Eutyches* || pleading thus for himself ——*Ve*
'*mihi, si sanctos Patres anathematizavero*——And *Dioscorus* thus||.
——'*Ego testimonium habeo sanctorum Patrum Athanasii, Gregorii,*
'*Cyrilli in multis locis, quia non oportet dicere post adunationem*
'*duas naturas, sed unam naturam Dei verbi incarnatam: Ego*
'*cum Patribus ejicior; Ego defendo Patrum dogmata, non transgredi-*
'*or in aliquo, & horum testimonia, non simpliciter, neque transitoriè,*
'*sed in libris habeo.* Thus *Dioscorus* in the Council of *Chalcedon*, and
'we find the subscription of 96 Bishops (either deluded, or for-
'ced, as they complained afterward||) to *Dioscorus* his definition in
'*that former Council.* But the great Council of *Chalcedon*, notwith-
'standing such an opposition, defined the contrary doctrine as of
'faith, and *deposed* the chief Actors in this *former* Council; a-
'mongst which were the *Patriarchs* of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*.
'And to the greater authority of this Council, all the rest (save
'only the Patriarch of *Alexandria*,) in the fourth Session came
'in, and submitted, not only for their *silence* (that would not serve
'the turn,) but *assent*. But after these, there were 11 Egyptian
'Bishops, *i. e.* all that were present from the Patriarchy of *A-*
'*lexandria* (how *Orthodox* I cannot say) that refused still to sub-
'scribe to the Councils decrees, alledging the fear of a persecution
'upon their return into *Egypt*, from their brethren at home, these
'at home it seems being also of a contrary judgment to the Coun-
'cil; yet the Council both established their decree without them:
'and required, upon *excommunication*, their *submission* to it; and *to*
'*it*, put into the Confession of their *Faith*. After this Coun-
'cil ended, *Timotheus* the usurping Patriarch of *Alexandria*, (af-
'ter *Proterius*, who was placed there by the Council, slain) and
'his adherents, continuing still to professe *Dioscorism*, or a miti-
'gated Eutychianism, condemned the Acts of *Chalcedon*, and much
'sollicited the Emperour by Letters to call a new Council; and
'besides these a very great faction in *Palestine* did the same, whose
'followers also continue the same division to this day, not only
'the *Egyptians*, but the *Ethiopians*, or *Abyssins*, *Armenians*, *Ja-*
'*cobites* of *Syria*, *&c*; giving to the Adherents of the Council, in
'those parts, the name of *Melchites*, or *Royalists*; because they
'pretended the corruption of this Council by the Emperors fa-
'ction: yet the owning of this Council by S. *Peters Chair*, and
'the acceptation thereof by much the *greatest* part of the Church
'Catholick, was and still is not doubted to be a sufficient *ratifica-*
'*tion* of its Acts, notwithstanding this storm in the Patriarchy of
'*Alexandria* against this fourth General Council, much worse than
'that of *Antioch*, against the third. Be-

|| In Concil. Constantinop. apud Conc Chalc. act. 1.

|| Conc. Chalc Actione prima.

|| V. Conc. Chalc. Act. 1, 4.

'Before the *seventh* General Council, the second *Nicene*, a 'question being on foot concerning the lawful use, and also relative veneration of Images; a Council assembled of above a hundred Bishops under *Constantinus Copronymus*, though indeed none of the Patriarchs joyned with them, defined it *negatively*; and, for making good their Tradition for this, produced several places out of the Fathers, particularly out of *Epiphanius*, *Nazianz.* *Chrysostom*, *Athanasius*, *Eusebius Cæsariensis*, and others, (See 2. *Conc. Nic. Act.* 6. *Tom.* 5.) yet, so soon as the Church recovered her liberty by the death of this Emperour, It in a fuller body, the Patriarchs also present, notwithstanding such a party preventing them, declared their Faith contrary, with an Anathema to all dissenters from their decree. §. 25. n. 5

In the Council of *Sardica* the Oriental Arrian Bishops, about 70. withdrew themselves from the Council to *Philippopolis*; because, it consisting of above 300 Western Bishops besides them, they saw their number too small to invalidate the Acts of a party so much greater; though indeed, being condemned already for Hereticks by the *Nicene Council*, they could have no just vote in any following. §. 26. n. 6.

Before all these Councils: a great question arose in the Church about the validity of Hereticks baptism, and whether the *Tradition*, commonly practised of *non-rebaptizing* those converted from *Heresie*, [though *Firmilian* seems to plead also a contrary Tradition in those parts where he lived. *Cæterum nos* (saith he,) *veritati, & consuetudinem jungimus, & consuetudini Romanorum consuetudinem, sed veritatis, opponimus: ab initio hoc tenentes, quod à Christo, & ab Apostolo traditum est*] were *Apostolical*, or no? A part of the Church Catholick questioning it, because another more certain Apostolical Tradition, *viz.* the *Scriptures*, seemed to them to declare plainly the contrary. A difficult controversie this was accounted; several Provincial Councils in divers parts were held about it: above 80 African Bishops assembled with their Primate, *S. Cyprian*, and likewise *Firmilian*, and some fifty other Eastern Bishops with him, judged it not Apostolical||. Yet afterward a General Council proceeded to decide it; and their definition was esteemed valid, and obliging, and those who continued in their former opinion (which in *Affrick* was no small number; in S. *Austins* time above 150 Bishops||) were from that time accounted *Hereticks*. 'Tis true, that this General Council || was held some 50 years after the other Provincial ones; and that, before this, several of the African Bishops had corrected their former opinion. But

|| Ep 73. ad Cypr.

|| See Dionysii Alex. Ep. ad Xystum. Euseb. l. 7. c. 4.

|| See the Conference with the Donatists. Baron. A. D. 411.

|| Are latense 1.

'I suppose none will say, that a General Council, if assembled at 'the same time, with those Provincial, could not justly have de- 'fined it against them, (as *Stephanus* his Council at the same time 'did) and justly have required their Obedience, as being, 'though a considerable number, yet a much smaller part, compa- 'red with the rest of the Bishops of the Christian world, and their 'Suffrage invalid *Contra tot millia Episcoporum, quibus tunc error 'in toto Orbe displicuit*, to use S. *Austin's* words *contra Cresconium.* 'l. 3. c. 3. Who elsewhere also ‖ speaks thus on this matter.—— '*Quæstionis hujus Obscuritas, prioribus Ecclesiæ temporibus ante 'Schisma Donati magnos viros, & magnâ charitate præditos, Patres, 'Episcopos, ita inter se compulit salvâ pace disceptare, atque flu- 'ctuare, ut diù Conciliorum in suis quibuscunque Regionibus diver- 'sa statuta nutaverint,* [So, contra *Cresconium*, l. 1. c. 33. he saith, 'Similiter inter Apostolos de Circumcisione quæstio, sicut postea 'de Baptismo inter Episcopos, non parvâ difficultate nutabat] *do- 'nec plenário totius orbis concilio, quod saluberrimè sentiebatur, eti- 'am remotis dubitationibus firmaretur.*]

‖ De Baptismo l. 1. c. 7.

§. 25. n. 7. By the *Acts* of these *Councils* I think it appears; that Points of former dispute, and such, where the contrary to some of them have been defended by a numerous Party in the Church, yet have been afterward defined, and declared, as matter of Faith; and that such opposition of a number, though in it self considerable, yet in respect of the whole, much smaller, hath been thought insufficient to debilitate the authority, and decisions of the rest, confirmed by the judgment of the Bishop of *Rome*, and the Chair of S. *Peter*; and that the Church may cut off from her Body, for the safety of the whole, (if such part happen to be gangred, or putrified) not only a little Finger, or Toe, but an Arm, or a Leg. But yet I would not have this so understood, as if that the Church's Councils, in this matter of the very greatest concernment, do at any time proceed to declare as matter of *Faith* any *Propositions*, save * such, as to disengaged judgments carry great evidence in them, flowing either from expres *former Tradition*, or the present *clear deduction*; and * such, as are admitted, and allowed by much the greatest part of the Church Catholick. ——

And in particular, the late *Council of Trent* (very prudently considering the great distraction, and dissatisfaction of those times, and their proneness to Schism) is said (if we may believe *Soave* ‖) to have entertained this *Maxim*; *That, to establish a Decree of Reformation, a major part of Voices was sufficient; but that a Decree of Faith could not be made, if a* considerable part

‖ Hist. l. 6 p. 576.

did

did contradict. But this *considerable part* must always be understood of such as are Catholick, *i. e.* by no formerly condemned Heresie, rendred uncapable of voting in the Church's Councils. And lastly, if a Contest arises, what a *part* may be called *considerable*, to whom the judgment of this can be left, save to the same *major part*, whether in, or out of, the Council, where-ever all are not agreed, I see not. This concerning the necessity, and the ancient practice, of a *much major* part at least (we keeping still within the bounds of the Church Catholick) its concluding the *Whole*.

Where it is also worth the noting concerning times past; that (though we set aside here, how necessary the Confirmation of Councils is by the always-esteemed most supream Authority Ecclesiastical on Earth, the *Bishop of Rome*, yet) never any *Heresie* (now universally so accounted) hitherto can be shewed, in any age, to have been confirmed in any Council, or accepted after it, by the *Major part* of Christianity, or of the *Church-Governors* thereof; such especially, as have Right to vote in Councils, because guilty of no *Heresie*; that hath been declared such by a former Council, §. 26. n. 1.

And for the Future likewise. Before that any *grievous*, and *pernicious* Error, should spread so far, as to infect a *major part* of the Ecclesiastical *Governors*, and so be past all cure from this supream Court, the Church's *Vigilancy*, from our *Lord's* promised perpetual assistance, and favour, may be presumed to be such, as that her *Councils*, either distributed in several *Provincial* ones, or united in a *General*, will condemn it. And then, after such censure, though its Patrons should grow to a major part of *Christianity*, yet do they now, to all, clearly appear, I say, not a less, but no, part of the *Church Catholick*. But yet, all those Texts of Scripture, (Prophecies, and Promises there), pressed by S. *Austin* against the *Donatists*, and the many Arguments he drew from them, seem to evince the contrary; that never any such Sect shall be, (I mean of *one* Denomination, or conspiring in any *one Heresie*), at any time, that shall for the multitude of its Followers, and Latitude of its Extent, exceed, or match the Catholick, As for *Heretick*s, or *Schismatick*s of many different Tenents, and Communions, dissenting from one another; what Magnitude, or Bulk the whole Mass of them put together, may amount to, or whether not transcend the Catholick, it much matters not. For the Catholick Church being (according to our Creed) always but *One*, and a Body united in a due subordination of its Governors; in its Service, Doctrine, Discipline, *&c.* so far

far as these model them, it is sufficiently, for its magnitude, and extent, discerned from all the rest, if, of any *one Society*, or *Church*, that hath the former coherence in its Members, the *Catholick* is the *greatest*, and the *most diffused*. Of which thus S. *Austin* observes ||.——*Non omnes Hæretici per totam faciem terræ, sed tamen Hæretici per totam faciem terræ; alii hîc, alii ibi,* ——*Alia Secta in Africâ, alia Hæresis in Oriente, alia in Egypto, alia in Mesopotamiâ. Diversis locis sunt diversæ, sed una Mater Superbia genuit, sicut una mater nostra Catholica omnes Christianos fideles toto Orbe diffusos.*——*Est in Africâ pars Donati; Eunomiani non sunt in Africâ; sed cum parte Donati; est hîc Catholica. Sunt in Oriente Eunomiani, ibi autem non est pars Donati; sed cum Eunomianis ibi est Catholica.* The summe is; the Catholick Church is every where, and every where Heresie; but the Catholick every where *one*, the other *diverse*; the Greatest, but many, may be Heresies; the Greatest that is one, must be the Catholick.

|| De Pastoribus c. 8.

§. 25. n. 2. There are two General Councils by Protestants frequently urged for decreeing, or confirming *Heresie*; the *second of Ephesus*, and that of *Ariminum*. But 1st. For that of *Ephesus*: Both the *whole West* out of the Council (then the greater, and more dignified part of the Church Catholick) and the *Pope's Legates*, and likewise many eminent *Eastern Bishops* in the Council (suffering much persecution for it from the present secular power) dissented from the Acts thereof; and the main Body of Bishops also, that in the Council subscribed to them, complained, in the following Council of *Chalcedon*, of *force* used.

And 2 For that of *Ariminum*. 1st. Though the major part of it had been *Arrians*; yet these, having been declared *Hereticks* already by the Council of *Nice*, and so now no true Members of the Church Catholick, || could rightly have no *Vote* therein; though the then *Arrian Emperor* forced upon the Council an admittance of them. So that if the *major* part of the Church-Governors, generally taken of that age, had maintained an Heretical Tenent, yet this was, after that the *major* part of *Christianity* in a former Council, and in a General acceptation thereof, had condemned this Tenent for *Heretical*; and so thence Christians might clearly discern the Maintainers of it to be no more *Members* of the Church Catholick, nor their present *Guides*. Especially the rest preserving a *Communion* separated from them.

|| See before Prop. 4.

§. 26. n. 3, But 2ly, He, that pleaseth to examine the History of this Council,

Council, and of these times, I think will find no ground to affirm *Arrianisme* at any time to have infected, or possessed a *major* part of *Christianity*. Which, because it is a thing much insisted on by Protestants, labouring thereby to prove, for some time, a *defection* of the *major* part of the *Church Catholick*, from one of the greatest *Articles* of the Christian Faith, I suppose it worth my pains, though stepping aside a little from my present Design, to give you a brief *Narrative* thereof. In which if already satisfied, you may, omitting it, pass on to §. 27. n, 4.

'If we review the Changes that were made in the 'Church before the Councils of *Ariminum*, and *Seleucia*. 1st. 'For the East. Though several eminent Catholick Bishops, by '*Constantius* his power, favouring the *Semi-Arrians*, were expelled from their Seats, upon several particular false Criminations, 'and among others, the pretence of their maintaining *Sobellianisme*, or confounding the *Persons* of the *Trinity*; yet was nothing then declared against the *Nicene Creed*. And after this 'Expulsion, there were, in a Council, held under him at *Antioch*, 'A. D. 341, of 99 Bishops assembled, only 36 *Arrian*, the rest 'Orthodox ||; (though the *Arrian* party indeed more powerful 'with the *Emperor*) : and the substance of the Form of Faith 'drawn up there, was though diminutive to the *Nicene*, yet *Catholick*; and such (saith *Sozomen* ||), *ut neque Arriani, neque* 'Concilii Niceni fautores, *compositionem verborum, quòd Sacræ literæ ejusmodi minimè complecterentur, insectari possent*. After this, 'upon the calling of the Council at *Sardica*, A. D. 347. the *Eastern* Bishops, assembled at *Philippopolis*, and, though they condemned *Arrianisme*, yet maintaining *Semi-Arrianisme*, were 'only 76. whilst the Orthodox *Sardican* Bishops were about 300.

|| See Baron. A. D. 341.

|| l. 3. c. 5.

'In the next *Council* following at *Sirmium*, convened for destroying the new Heresie of *Photinus*, both the *first*, and *last* 'Form of the Faith that was composed by the Eastern Bishops 'there, (for the second themselves disallowed) though *defective*, 'yet contained nothing in them, that might not well be taken in 'a *Catholick sence*. And in such a *sence* was the *first* explained by S. 'Hilarius, || writing in those very times. From which it follows, 'that it is not necessary, that all the *Subscribers* of these *Creeds*, 'should either be *Arrian*, or *Semi-Arrian*. And there seems to 'be a great hand of the *Divine Providence* in it, That it is *Professed* 'in these *Creeds*——That *Filius* did *ex Patris Substantiâ constare*; 'or, that he was *Patri per omnia similis*; *etiam quoad substantiam*, 'or *Essentiam*: Again, that he was *ante omne tempus, aut sæculum*;

|| lib. de Synodis.

'lum; all which is most true; But not *professed* there, what these 'Semi-*Arrians* held further; That the Son, though he had altogether the *like*, yet had not the *self-same*, essence with the *Father*; [which they thought could not consist with the *distinction* of the *Persons*].——And, that the Son, though *ante omne tempus*, yet was not *co-eternal* with the Father; [for this they thought consisted not with his *Generation*] this, I say, in those Creeds is not mentioned; they, it seems, either thinking it enough, as to the abatement of the former *Nicene* Decree, if they could free themselves, and others from being forced to profess any more in the *publick Faith*, than consisted with their *private Opinion*; or else knowing the party, that reverenced, and contended for the *Nicene* Faith, so considerable, as that, if their own Tenents were inserted, they would not have been at such times by a Major part subscribed. Thus things stood in the *East*, till the Council of *Seleucia* there, and of *Ariminum* in the West.

§. 26. n. 4, '2. Next. As for the West; till that Council of *Ariminum*, though, some chief *Bishops*, and among the rest, *Liberius*, 'Bishop of *Rome*, suffered Persecution for some three or four 'years before it, for not subscribing to the condemnation of *Athanasius*, unheard, (against whom the Emperor was much incensed, as supposing him the chief cause of the enmity between his 'Brethren, *Constance*, and *Constantine*, and himself ‖) yet the '*main Body* thereof both remained Catholick, and possessed of 'their Chairs, till the Meeting of this Council. And *Liberius*, 'being by the importunity of the *Roman* People recalled from his 'Banishment, (where he is said, * to have subscribed to one of 'the *Sirmian* Forms of *Faith*; but, as I said before, expressing 'nothing in it but what was Catholick;) & * *interdixisse Ecclesiâ illis, qui Filium Patri non substantiâ & cæteris rebus omnibus similem asseverarent* [i. e. the Arrians]‖ was now as constant an 'Oppugner of *Arrianisme* as any other, denying also his Consent 'to the Decree of this Council ‖. Now also the *Roman Clergy* 'were very famous for their Constancy in the *Nicene* Faith, and 'their refusing the Admission of *Felix*, supposed an *Arrian*, into '*Liberius* his Chair. And of the Orthodoxness, at this time, of 'the other *Western Prelates*, see what *Hilarius* saith in the beginning of his Book *De Synodis*, directed in his Exile to these Bishops; and lastly, S. *Jerom's new* wonder, ---*Ingemuit totus Orbis, & Arrianum se esse miratus est* spoken upon a strange, and 'unexpected issue of this Council at *Ariminum*, shews, there was 'no such thing before it.

‖ See Theodoret l. 2. c. 16.

* Sozom. l. 4. c. 14.

‖ See Theod. l. 2. c. 22.

To

'To come to the Council then. 1st. As this Meeting of about 400 Bishops assembled, there appeared not above 80. or, as *Athanasius* || saith, 50. addicted to *Arrianisme*, though some of these indeed, the Emperor's Favorites; accordingly, the *Decree* of this Council, confirming that of *Nice*, and condemning *Arrianisme*, was sent by them, (though never delivered), to the *Emperor*; and a dismission desired; which long delayed, several of them without leave departed; the rest, hindered from dissolving, upon much sollicitation of the Emperor's Agents, and the specious pretence of a firm Peace, and Union, so to be attained, of the *Western*, and *Eastern* Churches; yielded at last to subscribe a Form, in which was (not *rejected*, but) *omitted* ὁμοούσιον upon these terms, ——*Quod vulgo parùm intellectum, offendicula pareret; & quia in Scripturâ nusquam memoraretur*; ——And — *Neque adeo necessarium esset, de Personâ Patris, & Filii & Spiritus sancti, unam Substantiam nominari* || [where you may observe, the *truth* of it is no way denied]. This I say was *omitted*, but nothing *affirmed* in the Form, which was not well capable of a Catholick sence. If there was, let it be named: For this Expression——*Credo in Filium Dei similem Genitori suo Patri secundum Scripturas*, I suppose, none will say contains any Error, or untruth in it; nor opposeth *Identity* any more, than S. *Paul's Imago invisibilis Dei*, Col. 1.15.——Or *Christus aqualis Deo*, Phil. 2.6. (Which Texts were also then urged in defence of it) Especially, when 1st. the *Arrian* Forms usually joined *per omnia* in explication of it; as may be seen in the third *Sirmian* Form of Faith. (with which this was much what the same:) And so, the Emperor *Constantius* exacted this Subscription of *similis per omnia* from *Valens* himself, the *chief* Leader of the *Arrian* party ||; And 2. Next; the *Semi-Arrians*, in the *per omnia*, included also——*Similis Deo Patri secundum Essentiam*, or *Substantiam*; (from which the Catholicks rightly inferred Identity of Essence ||) And also, went so far, as to admit the word ὁμοούσιον too; and to profess *vocem illam in Concilio Niceno, ad perversam* Arrii *doctrinam expugnandam, sanctè, pièque positam.* ——And——*Se eandem Fidem, & ante-hac servasse, servare, & ad extremum servaturos* ||. Only they understood this word of the *Nicene* Fathers in a *diminutive* sence ||. And thus speaks S. *Basil* || of their Expression [*Similis secundum Substantiam*] *Si quid ipse sentiam, dicendum est quantum ad similem secundum Essentiam (siquidem huic dicto adjunctum fuerit, prorsus citra ullam ipsius essentiæ variationem) eam ego amplector; probroque vocem, ut quæ idem significet, quod* τὸ ὁμοούσιον.

§. 26. n. 9.

|| *Athan.* de Sydno.

|| *Theodoret.* l. 2. c. 21.

|| See *Epiph.* Her. 73.

|| *Socrat.* l. 4. c. 11.

|| *Socrat.* l. 3. c. 21

|| *Ad maximum Philosophum* Ep. 1.

'But yet because this Form, though in some sence true, 'was *general*, and *suspicious*, the *Catholick* Bishops at *Ariminum* 'refused to subscribe it, save upon some Additions to be annexed, 'so to secure the Church's *Faith* from *Arrianism*, and other miss- 'constructions, after ὁμοούσιον was now left out. In which Addi- 'tions, to give you *Severus* his words ‖——*Primùm damnatus est* ‖ Hist. l. 2. 'Arrius, *totaque ejus perfidia*; *deinde Filius Deo* Patri æqualis, & 'sine initio, *sine tempore pronuntiatur* [which things infer the 'Son's *Eternity*, and either *Consubstantiality* with the Father, or '*Polytheisme*, denied by the *Arrians*]——*Tum valens* (saith he) '*tanquam nostros adjuvans, subjecit Sententiam*; *Filium Dei non* 'esse *Creaturam, sicut cæteras Creaturas*, [i. e. (as he was under- 'stood by the Council) *sicut cætera omnia sunt Creaturæ*]. To 'these, S. *Jerom* adds, (as he saith, out of the Records of the 'Council it self), several *Anathema's* pronounced, and consented 'to by the *Arrians*; amongst which this is one,——*Si quis Filium* 'Dei *non dixerit æternum cum Patre, Anathema sit.* These 'things then being so submitted to by the *Arrian* Party, and the 'Catholick Faith now thought secure, the Council was dismissed. ‖ *Dialog. adverſ.* Luciferian. 'These things you may see related more at large by S. *Jerom* ‖ in 'defence of the Catholick Bishops in this Council, for the satis- 'faction of the *Luciferians*; a Sect, that, after the reflourishing 'of the Catholick Religion, would not admit those *Bishops*, who 'voted at *Ariminum*, or had afterward communicated with the 'Arrians, into their *Communion* (who likewise urged then, as 'well as the *Donatists* afterward, and the *Reformed* now, of the 'times before *Luther*, *that Christ had no Church* [except gene- 'rally corrupted]; And the Text ‖——*Cum venerit Filius hominis,* ‖ Luk 18.8. '*non inveniet Fidem super terram*; to which see S. *Jerom's* Answer 'in the same place.

§. 27. n. 1. 'This for *Ariminum*. At the same time, and upon the 'same Motive (the concluding a firm *Peace* in the Church *Uni- 'versal*) was another Council held in the East, at *Seleucia*. 'Where, by the Divine Providence, S. *Hilary*, then an Exile for 'the Catholick Doctrine in the East, was present; informed the 'Council of the constancy of the *Western* Bishops in the *Nicene* 'Belief; and in the Council himself earnestly contended for it; 'being also assisted by the *Egyptian* Bishops (except *Georgius* the 'Alexandrian Usurper) as himself saith, in his Book *contra* 'Constantium. This Council (supposed in a great part 'Semi-Arrian) proceeded no further, than only, to the confirm- 'ing of the forementioned *Antiochian* Creed (in which I said no-

thing

'thing was contained not Catholick); and afterward, to the ex-
'communicating of the Arrians. But, after this Council dissolved,
'the subscription, made at *Ariminum* by the Occidentals, being
'brought into the East, and the like, for a general union, with
'great importunity required by the Emperor, many of these *Se-*
'*leucian* Bishops at last yielded to it; the *Arrian* Agents first pre-
'tending (but falsely) to the West, that the *Eastern* Bishops
'would by no means admit of *Substantia* to be mentioned in the
'Creed; and then urging to these *Eastern* Bishops *professing* it,
'the prescription of the *West* for omitting of it? Mean-while, by
'the same *deception*, and *fraud*, was this subscription procured in
'the East from the Bishops, most of them Orthodox, or at most
'but semi-arrians, as at *Ariminum*. Of which *Seleucian* Bishops
'*Sozomen* saith‖——that *omnes, paucis exceptis, in eo uno dissederunt;* ‖ l. 4. 18.
'*quod* pars *filium Patri Consubstantialem, pars autem substantia simi-*
'*lem, esse dicerent.* And, of the fraud used *there* toward the Or-
'thodox, see much-what the same complaint made by *Nazianzen*
'(his father, a Catholick Bishop, amongst others, being involved in
'it,) as is by S. *Ierom* for the *West* —— *Impietati,* (saith he‖) *per scri-* ‖ Orat. in
'*pti dogmatis* ambiguitatem, *fenestram aperuit*; [*Concilium Constan-* laud. Athanas.
'*tinopolitanum*] *hoc quidem prætextu, quasi Scripturam vereretur,*
'*ac vocum probatissimarum usum amplecteretur.*——And——*Ea*
'*res permultos è nobis, invictos alioqui viros, in fraudem impulit;*
'*qui quamvis mente nequaquam prolapsi fuerint, subscriptione ta-*
'*men transversi acti sunt, &c.* See also *Liberius* his Letter to the
'Eastern Bishops, in *Socrates l.* 4. *c.* 11. Yet was not this subscri-
'ption, (any more then the VVestern at *Ariminum*), so universal;
'but that, besides *Athanasius*, and most of the Egyptian Bishops,
'there were several others of note, that *fully* and *openly* professed
'the *Nicene* faith; as *Cyril* Bishop of *Ierusalem*; *Meletius*, (who
'made that valiant confession thereof not only with his mouth,
'but, when that stopped, with his hands, before the people of *Anti-*
'*och*); *Eusebius Samosatenus*, and others. Nor yet was it so
'grateful to the Arrians, but that, in a meeting of them shortly
'after at *Antioch*‖, they grew bold to alter it, and at last to put in ‖ *Sozomen.* l.
'the Creed, not only what was general, or ambiguous, but false; 4. c. 23.
i.e. their own Anti-Nicene Tenent.

Thus passed *Constantius* his times; For some three years, af- §. 27. n. 2.
ter the *Ariminum* subscription, very severe. But, he dying, the face of the Church was suddenly altered; and, *Iulian* succeeding him, (equal to all, or rather less disaffected to the Catholicks, though a friend to none) the *Nicene faith* flourished as formerly; nor so much by a new Conversion of the Arrian Bishops to the

truth, as by a restorement of the formerly deprived *Catholick* Bishops to their honours, and the possession of their *Churches*. Of which thus S. *Jerom*‖, ——*Periclitabatur navicula Apostolorum* ——*Dominus excitatur, imperat tempestati, Bestia* [Constantius] *moritur, tranquillitas rediit. Manifestius dicam. Omnes Episcopi qui de propriis sedibus fuerant exterminati, per indulgentiam novi* 'Principis [*Julian*, who favoured at first the Catholicks] *ad Ecclesias redeunt.* 'Julian slain, after some years, under *Valens* 'ruling the East, and siding with the Arrians, a *new storm* arose 'there, against the Nicene faith; and a persecution, and expulsi'on of many of the Catholick Bishops; and these times it is, 'that S. *Basil* in his Epistles so sadly deplores? But 1*st*, This 'persecution extended not to the West, where *Valentinian* a Ca'tholick Emperour ruled, and where was only a *toleration* of the '*Arrians*; and so some of them, by seeming Catholick, as *Auxentius* Bishop of *Millan* before S. *Ambrose*, did some hurt. But 'then, by *Gratian* his Son, and Successor, this Toleration was re'voked; and also, in the East, upon *Valens* his Uncle's death, were 'the Catholick Bishops restored again to their seats, and the Ar'rians crushed. 2*ly*. In the East it never swelled so high, but 'that the Body of its Prelats also, though suffering much from 'the other favoured Party, remained Catholick, as may appear 'more particularly by *Liberius* his Lettter to the Oriental Bi'shops; and the 75 and 293. Epistles of S. *Basil*, written in the 'same time of *Valens* his persecution In which 75th. Epistle thus 'S. *Basil, Fuerat autem justius res nostras æstimare, non ex uno, aut* 'altero eorum, *qui ad veritatem haud recto pede ingrediuntur sed ex* 'multitudine totius orbis Episcoporum, *qui gratiâ Christi conjuncti* 'nobis sunt. ——*Unamines omnes, eodemque sensu præditi sumus.* 'Itaque si quisque Communionem nostram fugit, ne prudentiam ve'stram lateat, ab universâ illum Ecclesiâ sese divulsisse.

‖ *Adversus Lucifer. l. 2.*

‖ *Apud Socr. l. 4. c. 11.*

§. 27. n. 3. 'And now by this Relation may be understood the true sence 'of those *places* of the *Fathers*, that are urged for a defection of 'the greatest part of the Church in these times from the true 'faith; which, as they are now pressed by many *Protestants* a'gainst the *Roman* Church, so some of them were anciently by the 'Donatists against S. *Austin*; to whose 48. Epistle I refer you, to 'peruse his Answer. When therefore S. *Hierom* saith‖—— 'Tunc [after the Council of *Ariminum*] usiæ *nomen abolitum est,* 'tunc Nicænæ fidei damnatio conclamata est——And——*Nomine u*'nitatis, & fidei infidelitas *scripta est*, he meaneth, *Infidelitas*, &c. 'according to that *sence*, and *glosse*, as the Emperor and Arrian 'party made of the decree, after the Council ended. Saying also,

‖ *Dialog. adv. Luciferianos.*

——*In-*

——'*Ingemuit totus Orbis* [*totus Orbis*, becauſe the *Eaſtern* Biſhops at *Conſtantinople*, as well as the *Weſt* before them at *Ariminum*, by the ſame fraud made the ſame ſubſcription], *& miratus eſt ſe eſſe Arianum* (ſee the like Comment in *Galat.* 5. 9.) *Arianum* i. e. quite contrary to their intention, and ſence, and by an Interpretation of ſome part of the decree ſo, as it contradicted another: therefore alſo (*ibid.*) he ſaith: how, afterward, *Concurrebant Epiſcopi qui Ariminenſibus dolis irretiti, ſine conſcientiâ Hæretici ferebantur, conteſtantes Corpus Domini, & quicquid in Eccleſia ſanctum eſt, ſe nihil mali in ſuâ fide ſuſpicatos.* Whence he expoſtulates with the Luciferians——*Cur damnaſſent eos, qui Ariani non erant? Cur Eccleſiam ſcinderent in concordiâ fidei permanentem? &c.* From which may be gathered the meaning of ſeveral paſſages urged‖, out of his Chronicon, declaring the eſtabliſhment of Arrianiſm in the *Arimine*, or *Sirmian* Council; and out of his Dialogue againſt the Luciferians, of the Confeſſors, (but a few,) admitting all the reſt to their Communion; which (he ſaith, there, expreſly) was done —— *Non, quod Epiſcopi poſſent eſſe qui Hæretici fuerant; ſed quod conſtaret eos, qui reciperentur*, hæreticos non fuiſſe. So *Liberius* his words‖,——*Omnes illi ferè Epiſcopi, qui Arimini convenerant; quique vel fallacibus ineſcati illecebris, vel vi compulſi, à fide tum quidem deſciverant; &c.* with whom he alſo joines the Orientall Orthodox Biſhops, to whom he writ [*Quibus item vos per verſutas blanditias, &c*] are to be underſtood only of their *failing* from ſuch a *plenary confeſſion* of their faith, as their Chriſtian duty obliged them to, (whom I do not go about here to excuſe from all fault, but from hereſie). and ſuch expreſſions as theſe—*ſubſcriptionem priſtinam damnabant—fidei formulæ Ariminenſi Anathema denunciârunt*; to be underſtood, that they condemned it, not as in their own former ſence, falſe; but as, by the later Arrian ſence, perverted. In the ſame ſence are thoſe things, ſaid by *Vincentius Lirinenſis*‖, *Severus*‖, and others, to be expounded; and thoſe paſſages of *Nazianzen*‖; where he ſpeaks of the complying *lapſe* of many of the too-credulous Eaſtern Biſhops, and among the reſt of his father, yet always conſtantly Catholick. As for S. *Baſils* ſad compl ints‖ of the overflow of Arrianiſm, (to which may be added ſeveral in *Nazianzen*‖) they were made concerning the times of *Valens*; and then, concerning the *Eaſt*, ſubjected to his power; when can be no queſtion as to the Church *univerſal*, of the major part of its Prelats, their profeſſing the Catholick faith; (Of which ſee his forequoted Epiſtles‖.) As neither can there be, of the times be-

‖ See *Tillot* Rule of faith, p. 167, &c.

‖ *apud* Socr. l. 4. c. 11.

c 6.

‖ Hiſt. l. 2.

‖ *In Orat. de laud. than. & de funere Patris.*

‖ *Epiſt* 71. &c.

* *Orat. in* Arrian.

‖ Epiſt. 75. 293.

'before *Ariminum*, as to the West; the persecution, then, being 'in the cause, of *Athanasius*, not, of the Nicene faith; so that, 'how long soever the Arrian errour may be said to have conti-'nued (as it hath to this day in the Mahometans, and, of late, the 'Socinians;) yet the great eclipse, which the Nicene Faith may 'be thought to have suffered thereby, was only from *Ariminum* 'to the restorement of the Catholick Bishops made by *Iulian*, '*i.e.* for the space of three years: though, then also the *Lights* 'of the Church were not extinguished, but only obscured, be-'cause removed out of their Candlesticks; And what hath 'bin said here of the *Catholick's subscription* to the Arrian forme 'of faith, may be said of their communion also with them, which 'lasted only for that small time, that they imagined them, from 'the additions made to the forme at *Ariminum*, and before the 'manifesting of their equivocation, good Catholicks.

Lastly, one thing more in this Arrian defection is very con-'siderable: that the Anti-Nicene faction divided presently into 'two *Sects* (as is usual to those who leave the unity of the 'Church,) the *Arrians*, and the *semi-Arrians*. Which Sects per-'secuted, excommunicated, ejected out of their Chairs, one ano-'ther. Now one of the properties of the Church-Catholick in 'the Creed being its *unity* (*Credo unam, &c.*) for the discerning 'of it always from other Societies, by its more eminent magni-'tude and extent, it is sufficient; if, of all those Bodies or Chur-'ches, that can any way pretend to this property, and that are a-'ny way united within themselves, and contradistinct to others, 'it be the *greatest still*, and *most diffused* (as, if of the two divided 'parties, neither the Arrian, nor semi-Arrian equalled the Catho-'lick) though by the whole masse of all these Bodies, that fight 'with one another, cast up together, it should be exceeded. Of 'which see what is said before §. 26. n. 1.

'I have, contrary to my first intention, related this matter more 'at large; as well knowing, this defection of the Church in the 'time of Arrianism to be the main, or only instance wherewith 'Protestants seek to countenance that *later*, and *more universal* '*defection* which many of them charge upon it since the times of '*Antichrist*; from *A.D.* 600. or sooner, till the coming of *Lu-'ther*: a defection (as some say) of above a thousand years 'durance. Now to return to the matter in hand.'

§. 27. n. 4. Prop. 13. 13. From these things Catholicks infer: *That both the* Decrees *in a Council, and* acceptation *of them out of it, made by a* much major *part of the* Church-Governours, (*especially, this ma-*

jor

(or part also being joyned to the supreme Pastor *of the Church) ought, undeniably to conclude the* whole; *and that all the obedience (forementioned) is due to this much greater, though some smaller part dissenting; and that an Opposition of* their *definitions in matter of faith becomes* heresie; *and a separation from* their *Communion,* upon *their requiring an approbation of, and conformity to, such their decrees, becomes* Schism; *if an opposition to, or separation from, the* whole, *be so.*

14. As for that way, or those marks, that are given usually by Protestants‖, by which Christians are to discern, in any division of them, the Society of the *true* Church-Guides (whether these happen to be more, or fewer; of a higher, or lower rank, than the other; as they say somtimes they may be the One, somtimes the other) from the *false*; namely these two, 1 *The right teaching of the Christian doctrine*; 2 And *right Administration of the Sacraments.*

§. 28. Prop. 14.

‖ See *Calv. Instit.* l. 4 c. 1. §. 9.

1st, If any are directed to finde out by these *marks* those *Guides*, not only whose Communion they ought to joyn with; but from whose judgment they ought to learn, which is the same *true* Christian doctrine; and *which* the *right* administration of the Sacraments; *i.e.* are by those marks, first known, to find out those persons, by whom they may come to know these marks; (as for example; if one that seeks a Guide to direct him, what he is to believe in the Controversie of the *Consubstantiality* of *God* the Son with the *Father*, is first to try, if Consubstantiality be true: and then to chuse him for his Guide in this point, that holds it.) The very Proposal of this way seems a sufficient confutation of it. For what is this, but to decide that first themselves, for the decision of which they seek to anothers judgment? And there is no question, but, after this, they will, in a search, pitch on a Judge that decides as they do: but then, this is seeking for a Confederate, for a Companion: not seeking for a Guide, for a Governour. When they can state the true doctrine themselves, their search for a *Guide* to state it is at an end; and they may then search rather to whom to teach it, than of whom to learn it.

§. 29. n. 1.

‖ See §. 29 n. 2.

Tis granted indeed, (supposing the marks above-named were only to be found among the right Church-Guides (which is not so‖) that these right Guides may be discerned from false by this mark, *i.e.* by *the truth of that doctrine* which they teach, by so many, as can attain the certain knowledge of this *true doctrine* by some other means, or way; as, by the *Holy Scriptures*, *Fathers*, &c. Nor is private mens trying the truth of the Doctrine of these differing Guides (by these) denied here to be lawful;

ful; nor denied, that the Propoſal of ſuch a trial to the People, may, by the *true Guides*, even by the *Apoſtles*, be made uſe of with good ſucceſs; becauſe the Scriptures, *&c.* may evidence, to ſome perſons intelligent, in ſome Controverſies leſs difficult, the truth of thoſe Doctrines, which ſome of the learned, out of great paſſion, or intereſt, may gainſay. But then, for all ſuch points, wherein a private man's trial by *Scripture* is very liable to miſtake, and the ſenſe thereof not clear unto him, (as no private perſon hath reaſon to think it clear in ſuch points of Controverſie, wherein the Church-Guides, examining the ſame *Scriptures*, yet do differ among themſelves, and perhaps the major part of them from him;) here, he muſt neceſſarily attain the knowledge of his right Guide, by ſome other Marks preſcribed him for that purpoſe; and not by the truth of that doctrine, or clearneſs of thoſe Scriptures, for inſtruction in the truth, or ſence, of which he ſeeks ſuch a Guide. Unſound therefore is that Poſition of Mr. *Stillingfleet's*. (Rat. Account, *p.* 7.) *That of neceſſity the* Rule, [I ſuppoſe he means, and by it, the Truth] *of Faith and Doctrine muſt be certainly known, before ever any one can with ſafety depend upon the judgment of any* Church: And very infirm that arguing of his, and ſo all, that, he afterward builds upon it, where he deduceth from this Propoſition conceded—*That, a Church, which hath erred, cannot be relied on* [in matter of Religion]; *therefore men muſt be ſatisfied, whether a Church hath erred, or no, before they can judge, whether ſhe may be relied on, or no*: for, though this be allowed here, that ſuch Church as may be *relied on*, hath, amongſt other properties, or ſure marks, this for one, that ſhe doth not, or cannot *err*; yet many other *Marks*, or Properties ſhe may have, by which men may be aſſured, ſhe may be relied on, who are not firſt able to diſcern, or prove all her Doctrines for truth, or demonſtrate her *not erring*. Such arguing is much-what like to this. That Body, which caſts no *light*, cannot be *fire*, therefore a man muſt firſt be ſatisfied, whether ſuch a body gives light, before he can judge whether it be fire. Not ſo; becauſe one blind, and not ſeeing the light at all, yet may certainly know it is fire, by another property; by its ſcorching *Heat*—Or like this: No Book that contains any falſe Propoſition in it can be the Book of Holy Scripture; therefore men muſt be ſatisfied, whether ſuch Book contain any falſe Propoſition in it, or no, before they can judge, whether it be the Book of Holy Scripture, or no. Not ſo; for men ordinarily, by another way, *viz.* univerſal Tradition, become aſſured that ſuch Book is *Holy Scripture*; and thence collect, that it contains nothing in it contradictory, or falſe: and

ſo

so it is for the true Church, or our true Guide; that though she always conserveth Truth, yet men come to know her by another way; and, of her, first known, afterward learn that truth, which she conserveth

But 2ly, These Protestant Marks, *viz. Truth of Christian doctrine*, and *right Administration of Sacraments*, if we could attain a certain knowledge of them *another* way, and needed not to learn them from the *Church*, yet are no *infallible* Mark of that Catholick Body, and Society, to which Christians may securely adhere, and rank themselves in its Communion: because such Body, when *entirely* professing the Christian *Faith*, yet still may be Schismatical; and some way guilty of dissolving the Christian *Unity*, as Dr. *Field*, amongst others, freely concedes. Who ‖ therefore *to make up* (as he saith) -- *the Notes of the true Catholick Church absolute, full, and perfect, and generally diginguishing this Church from all other Societies, adds to these two* (the entire profession of saving Faith, and the right use of Sacraments), a third Mark, *viz.* an Union, *or connexion of men in this Profession, and use of these Sacraments under* lawful Pastors, *and* Guides, *appointed and authorized to direct, and lead them in the happy ways of eternal Salvation.* Which *Pastors* lawfully authorized, he ‖ grants those not to be, *who though they have power of* Order, *yet have no power of* Jurisdiction, *neither can perform any Act thereof* (*quæ Jurisdictio descendit Ordinatis à Superiore*, as he notes in the Margin out of *Bonavent.*): And then, we for the trial of the lawful Jurisdiction of such Pastors, leaving these other Marks, must return to the former *Rule*, delivered. §. 23.

§. 29. n. 2.

‖ Of the Ch. l. 2. c. 2. p. 31, 33.

‖ l. 1. c. 14.

CHAP. IV.

An Application of the former Propositions in a search, which of the opposite present Churches (or Ecclesiastick Governors thereof) is our true Guide. §. 30. *Several Motives perswading, that the* Roman, *and other Western Churches, united with It, and the Head thereof, S.* Peter's *Successor, are* It, 1st. *Their being the very same Body with that, which, Protestants grant, was* 150 *years ago* this Guide, §. 33. 2ly. *That Body, to which Christians ought to submit, if the Rule*

‖ §. 23. *delivered*, Prop. 12. ‖ *be observed.* §. 35. 3ly. *That Body, that owns, and adheres to, the Definitions and Decrees of all those former Councils, which the Church of preceding Ages hath received as General, or obliging; as well those since, as those before, the sixth, or seventh Century.* §. 37.

§. 30. A Perpetual being of these *Spiritual Guides* infallibly directing in necessary Controversies; and the due subjection Christians have to, and dependance *on them*, being thus asserted in the former Propositions. The next Enquiry will be *Which*, or *where* now is this present, visible Society, and Church consisting of such a governing *Clergy*, and right instructed *People*; of which learned Protestants ‖ seem to accord with Catholicks, that some where now it is; that in no age, nor at any time it ceaseth; and that it always hath been hitherto, and ever shall be, infallible in necessaries,

‖ See before Prop. 3. §. 3.

Now *General Council*, or Representative of the present Church Catholick, united in one body, we see there is none at this present. but the same present *Governors* there are, that do constitute, and sit in, these Councils when called; only these now not united, but dispersed through the several Nations of Christendom.

And these present Governors, as to this *Western* part of Christendom, (which indeed is by much the more considerable, the Eastern being so greatly debilitated, and consumed by the heavy yoke of *Mahometans*) are divided into two chief *Bodies*, or *Communions*.

One body of them there is, * which adhereth to the *Prime Patriarch* of the universal Church, the Bishop of *Rome*; and so hath done from their first Christianity, acknowledging a due subordination unto him; and * which also generally admits, for its present Tenents, and Belief, the Doctrines of the *Councils*, which have been celebrated in the Church in former ages; not only those of a few of the first Councils, which stated matters of *ancient* Controversie concerning the *Trinity*, the *Natures*, and *Person* of our Lord, *&c.* now fixed in the common Creeds; but those of all the rest since, which have stated Matters of *later* Debate, and many also of those Points, which are at the present disputed by Protestants; ‖ * which admits I say the Doctrines *of all these Councils*, even to the present times (some *few* only excepted, either which the *Roman* Patriarch, with the greatest part of the *West*, never approved; or which greater Councils coming after them, have annul-

‖ Disc. 1. §. 50. n. 2.

annulled) and, in particular, *of the last Council* that hath been held in the Church, that of *Trent*; which was purposely assembled about, and hath decided most of the present Protestant Controversies,

To which great Body in the *West* I may join the *Eastern* Churches, as agreeing with it; and not remonstrating against its Conciliary Decrees, in most of the Doctrines questioned by Protestants ||; and in their present publick Service, and Rites, all as dissonant (if not more) from the Protestant's present Doctrines, and Practices, as the *Roman* is; and I think, (all considered), of the two, the *union* of the Reformed more difficult to the *Oriental* Churches,

|| See Disc. 3. §. 158.

§. 32.

Another *Body* of present *Governors* there is (that is within the profession of *Christianity*, but not allowed by the former to be within the bounds of the *Church Catholick*; (as the Church Catholick, all grant, is, or may be, much narrower, than Christianity, because all Hereticks, or Schismaticks are Christians, but not Catholicks) Who having heretofore, together with the rest, in their Forefathers, held a Communion with, and acknowledged a subordination to, the *Western Patriarch*, and having also submitted to all those *later Councils*, to which the rest, till a litle before the last Council, that of *Trent*, yet have since (now somwhat above a hundred years) renounced *external Communion* with the said Patriarch, and the Churches adhering to him; *i. e.* to continue therein any longer, upon those terms, upon which their *Fore-Fathers* formerly enjoyed it, and have withdrawn their Obedience from the former Councils, preceding their Reformation, that have bin held in the Church for almost this 1000 years. I mean such as have been of Note, and whose Decrees are extant, and which have stated any matter of Controversie; the entire Acts of none of which they can own, and stand to: Even those two Councils || which they urge as favouring them in matter of Images, being against them in some other points; and the Doctrine also of those times, wherein most of these Councils were held, being, as they say, much corrupted. Many of them chiefly supporting, and justifying this their strange discession from their Mother the Church, with a strong conceit, that she had been, for many former Ages, turned a Whore || and out of a strange imagination they had of an *Antichristian General defection*, happened, not *from* the Church Catholick, (though that but too *apparent* in *Mahometanisme*) but *in* it, ever since the fifth, or sixth Century; or, some also say, higher; according to the time, wherein the Church's common Doctrines, or Practices began first to displease them. Yet

|| Conc. Constantinop. sub Copronymo & Francofurd

|| Rev. 17.

this *Fancy*, after that, by divine permiſsion, it had had its full influence in incouraging ſo great an *Innovation*, and change in Religion, as would hardly have been ſo vigorouſly proſecuted upon any other Motive whatever, (*Luther*, the firſt Reformer; helping himſelf more with theſe words, *Antichriſt*, and *Babylon*, continually dropping from his Pen, than by all his other Arguments) This Fancy I ſay, now of late begins to be, by the more *wiſe*, and *learned* amongſt them, laid aſide; After they had diſcovered the Miſchief alſo it began to work in the ſhaking of *Epiſcopacy*, and ſeveral other *Neceſſary*, and *Apoſtolical* Conſtitutions in the Government of the Church, which they, more ſober, would have to be retained ſtill in the new Model of Religion; but the other, more zealous to be ejected with the reſt. To ſatisfie your ſelf in which matter, you may view *H. Grotius*‖, and Mr. *Thorndike's*‖, and Dr. *Hammon'ds*‖ new Schemes of Antichriſt, and his Kingdom, they removing it again (with the Catholick Doctors) quite out of the Pale of the *Church*, and freeing the *Reformed* of their former Fears. Which rectifying of ſo pernicious a Miſtake of the firſt *Reformers* by a more *ſober* poſterity, well conſidered, may I hope in time much conduce to the Re-union of that Body, which, by this *Great Engine* of *Satan* chiefly, hath been heretofore ſo unhappily divided.

‖ Notes on the Apocalypſ.
‖ Right of Church, in the review p. CLVI, &c.
‖ In his premonition concerning the Apocalypſ

§. 33.

In ſuch a Diviſion then, to proſecute our Enquiry: *viz.* who, or where, theſe *Governors* be, that are our preſent *Guide*, and that ſeem ſo much *authorized* by both ſides in the former Propoſitions.

1. Firſt: If this Queſtion had bin made by any 150 years ago, there had bin no difficulty to reſolve it. For, that *Body*, here firſt named, was then the *whole*, or the only Catholick Church, as to the VVeſt (further than which he, that would then have gone for *choice* of his Religion, would have fared worſe‖). That *Body* therefore, then, muſt have bin conformed to, or the *whole* deſerted; as indeed it was‖. Now this Body is not changed in its *Liturgies*, in its *common Doctrines*, in its *Rites*, ſince that time, from what the *Whole* was then: VVitneſs the Reformation it ſelf, which was made againſt theſe very Doctrines, and Practices that are now‖ as *impoſed* on them, before the being of the Council of *Trent*; though ſome,‖ perhaps to lighten the charge of *Schiſm*, would fain perſwade the contrary; and I wiſh, the only conteſt between the two preſent Churches were put upon the trial of this.

‖ See Diſc. 3. §. 26. &c,
‖ See 1 Diſc. §. 55. n. 4.
‖ 1 Diſc. §. 47. --50. n. 2. --36 n. 5
‖ Stilling fl. p. 268 370.-- Field p. 880. 1875 214.

§. 34.

It is here apparent then, which of theſe two, at that time, (when as yet one of them was not) had bin our lawful *Guide*, and

Mother

Mother, Church; and easily cleared, what then were its doctrines: Of which *Guide* Protestants also testifie; That, then, it erred not in Necessaries. See before *Prop.* 3. §. 3. &c. —*Disc.* 1. §. 41. And that also, in all other points, Christians were to believe it, so many as could not demonstrate the contrary: See *Prop*, 9, 10. §, 20, 21. We therefore may promise the same security to our selves in following this *part* of the Catholick Church, (as the Protestants call it, though, it calls it self *the Whole* still) now, as our Forefathers had in following the *Whole* then. And this, resting still in this Body remaining the same with what once was the whole, seems security enough to all those, who, if this Body were now so entire, and universal as it was then, durst not now attempt a separation from the whole; or to those, who are not able to demonstrate the former separation, that hath been made, just, and necessary; the tie of Obedience to, and acquiescence in the doctrines of these Guides, Being dissolvable by none, save demonstrators of their Errors ||; which, among the Church's Subjects, can never be but a very small Number.

|| See 3 Disc. §. 44. §. 35. 2.

2ly. But, besides this main Motive of submission to the first Body, as our right Judge, and Guide, because we find it the very same with the Church Catholick that was 150 years ago: [whereas the second Body confess themselves a Church, that is since *separated* from the external Communion of that other, and a body reformed from the pretended Errors, and Corruptions found therein; *i. e.* from the Errors, which some of the *Subjects*, and of the *Flock* (for, such I reckon a particular person, or Church, in respect of the whole) found in their *Guides*, and *Judges*, when themselves also were inferior to them, both in their paucity of number, and quality of place]: I say, besides this, in the second place, If we will follow the Principle laid down in the 12th, Proposition ||; *i. e.* in any Contradiction happening, to adhere to the *Superior* persons, and Synods, as our true Guide; and, amongst these, to a major part as our Guide sooner, than to a Minor;

|| §. 23.

['By which *Rule* the Christian world hath been preserved 'hitherto from all those, which both sides agree to have bin, *He-* '*resies*; and which Rule unless we follow, we dissolve all *Govern-* *ment*, and all *Unity* of this Body of Christ, and introduce flat A- 'narchy, and *Confusion*; whilst, for a *Monarchical* Government 'of the Church, Protestants will not hear of it; and, in an *Ari-* '*stocratical*, or Government consisting of many, it cannot be 'presumed, but that there will be some Dissenters; which, if they 'may be followed against the others, I ask by what Rule of Go- 'vernment was it, that the *Arrian*, *Eutychian*, and *Nestorian* Bi-

'shops

'shops were forced to yield, and were divested of their Pastoral 'authority, or guiding, any longer, by the rest of the Bishops, in 'the Council of *Nice*, *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*?'; Lastly, if we will be guided by the *Church Catholick* out of *Council*, as we are in it; Thus also we must needs acknowledg the *first* of these Bodies for our true, and rightful Judge. For, it is apparent, that this first is a much major part of the Church-Governors, joyned also with the prime Patriarch of Christianity; and so to be preferred by us before a *minor*, separated. If you would know then, which of these two present Bodies of Ecclesiasticks you are to obey out of a *Council*; First, do you imagine them now met in a Council; and next, that in this Council every one delivers, concerning things debated, that which is his present judgment, when called to the Council; [and this is but reasonable; since there is no likelihood of *new demonstrations* to be made in the Council, which already, in so much writing on all sides, these Bishops have not seen; and since *former tradition*, and not *argument*, is the chief rule of their proceedings: and no example is found in any Council past, wherein its members have concluded any thing contrary to the preceding common faith of that Age, wherein such Council was held]. Especially imagine, what their sentence might be concerning this point; whether the former Councils that have bin, may have erred in their Definitions, which one point, stated negatively, ruines Protestantism. And then, if your conscience, weighing the present perswasions and practices of Christian Prelats doth convince you, that the Votes of the one side would be very inconsiderable in it to the number of the other, as likewise that *S. Peters* Chair (concerning which Chair the Church's ancient Maxime hath bin, *Sine Pontifice Romano nihil finiendum*||) would join with this major part, against the other; what remains, but that you here follow the same Body in the Interval of a Council, which you must have followed in the time of a Council; unless also you will reverse the common Laws of Councils?

|| See in Athan. Apol. 2. Epist. Julii-- & Innocentii, Ep. 91. apud August.

§. 36. Note, that this is spoken of the Great *Body* of the *Western* Churches contained under the *Roman* Patriarch, which do yet by Gods permission enjoy all the priviledges of an undisturbed Ecclesiastical Government, and which seems, by reason of its numerous Clergy, and populacy, and extent of the arms of this body, & propagation of its faith, into all the other quarters of the world, to be the *greatest* part of Christianity, & that which hath bin alwais the most *dignified*, by reason of S. *Peters* Chair. From which for any of the *Western* Body to make an appeal, out of these bounds, to the present *Eastern* Churches, now hindred, by the great oppressor

of

of Christianity there, & *disturbed* in the Exercise of any such Judicature, and also much *divided* among themselves and who have *not met* in any *Council* for this eight hundred years, save, by sending at several times, their delegates, into the West, For any, I say, to make an appeal from a Church flourishing in Government, and discipline, in learning, and records of Antiquity, the *City* still on a *Hill*, and *Candle* on a *Candlestick*, to seek for Votes among the *Jacobites*, *Maronites*, *Caphtites*, *Armenians*, *Abyssines*, or Greek Churches, &c. several of them being suspected of ancient Heresies, and, if Hereticks, no members of the Catholick Church, appears nothing else, but the refusal of a trial; and avoiding the sentence of any such Guide, and judge, as *Gods Providence* hath afforded us; and, besides this, is *an Appeal*, where could those Churches now freely deliver their sentence, and were now set on the Bench as this present Judge, the Appealants can have no hopes of any success to their cause. For that these Churches, or at least the greatest Body of them (as is shewed elsewhere||) appear to keep as great a distance from the reformed, as the major part of the Western Body doth.

|| Disc. 3. §. 158.

§. 37. 3.

3ly If the *Councils*, that are extant and reputed for *General*, since the first six or seven hundred years to the times of *Luther's* reformation shall be by any acknowledged, either for General: or for the most universal, that could well be convened; or, at least, that are found actually to have bin convened (a thing, which I think, though the testimony, the *present Church* gives to them, be made no use of, the common veracity of History will clear to us; besides that, none hath any other *Councils* of an equal authority in these times to nominate, and set up against them; and those, who demolish them, do it, without erecting, or discovering to us any *better*, or any *besides*): I say, if any think meet, to relie on the judgment of these past Councils in the present matter, these also will sufficiently evidence to us, that the first of these *Bodies* fore-named is our present rightful Guide, and Judge. For, since the *Acts*, and *Laws* of such Councils are not only of force, and obligatory, to those present times, wherein they sit, but to all future Ages; with the execution of which *Acts*, and *Decrees*, the succeeding *Pastors*, and chief Governors of the Church, in their several stations, and residences, in all following times, stand charged, till these are by an equal authority reversed, It seems clear, that in any division (hapning afterward) of these *Pastors*, those are to be acknowledged our right Guides, who own, adhere to, and propagate, the Definitions and Laws of these former Councils. Now this we see, the first of these two *Bodies* doth; as the *latter* renounceth

nounceth them; yet renounceth them without the producing of the patronage of any Councils at all in their ſtead; pulling down as it were all the Church's, Caſtles, and Forts, (if I may call her *Councils* ſo) againſt the incurſions of errours, and hereſies, that have bin built in ſeveral Ages for near a thouſand years; and yet ſhewing none other at all, for Chriſtians, in the many points that have been diſputed, to repair to, but leaving the ſad Spectators of theſe their demolitions quite diſheartned; as diffiding in the Churches judgment (ſo much decried for error); and having yet more reaſon to diſtruſt their own; and ſo not knowing, in this caſe, whither to betake themſelves, for the ſetling of their Religion, and conſcience. For ſurely, this unerringneſs, which the late Reformers have denied to thoſe *great Bodies* of the Church, they cannot, in reaſon, aſſume to thoſe *leſſer Conventions* of their own.

CHAP. V.

The Pretended ſecurity of thoſe Proteſtants, Who deny any certain, living or perſonal Guide, infallible in Neceſſaries: Affirming That all neceſſary matters of Faith are, even to the unlearned, clear in Scripture: and the Controverſies in non-Neceſſaries needleſs to be decided §. 38. *Neceſſaries clear in Scripture: Becauſe God hath left no other certain means or Guides for the knowledge of them* §. 39. n. 1. 1 *No Guide, which is infallible.* 2 *Which the unlearned, in any Diviſion can diſcern from falſe, or know and underſtand their decrees better, than the Scriptures.* 3 *Or, which the Scriptures direct them to, for learning Neceſſaries* §. 39. n. 2. *The Reply,* 2. *That Evidence of the Scriptures hath been the uſual Plea of former Hereticks, in their diſſenting from the Church* §. 40. n. 1. 2. *That, as to the main and principal Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, the ſufficiency of the Rule of Scripture is not denied, by Roman Catholicks; But only the clearneſs thereof, as to all mens capacities, queſtioned: and another Guide held neceſſary* §. 40. n. 2. *It is replied then,* 1. * *Concerning the clearneſſe of Scripture* 1 *That ſome of the Controverſies in Religion, ſince the Scriptures written, have bin concerning Points neceſſary* §. 41. 2 *That the more clear all Neceſſaries are in Scripture, the more ſecurity Chriſtians have in the Churches judgement* § 42. 3 *That there is no neceſſity, that all Neceſſaries be revealed in Scripture, clearly, to all.* 1 *Becauſe it*

is

is sufficient. If the Scriptures, for the things doubtful therein, direct to these Guides §. 43. [2] *Sufficient, if* such things *be cleared to these Guides, by other Apostolical Tradition* §. 44. [3] *Or, if the* true sence *of the Scriptures touching these matters, be cleared to them, by Tradition* §. ib. [4] *Or, if such sence be clear, in the Scriptures themselves (well examined, and compared), to them; though not, to all* §. 45. 2 y, Concerning the Guide, [1] *That Scripture in what it is ambiguous, cannot be a Guide* §. 49. n. 1. [2] *That it is not necessary, that Christians, be in, or by, the Scriptures, directed to another Guide* ib. n. 2. [3] *Yet that they are, in the Scriptures, so directed* §. 47. n. 3. [4] *And may, in many points, more easily understand the sence of their decisions, than of the Scriptures* §. 48.

§. 38.

THe usual security that some of them give their followers, is this [α] *That all Controversies that arise in matters of Faith, or in matters very profitable*||, *are so clearly decided, or determined in Scripture, that none, learned, or unlearned, using that industry, which humane prudence, and ordinary discretion (his condition considered) adviseth him to, can err in them*||. [where the *unlearned* seem also to be put in, lest these at least, for their ignorance, should be referred from the *Scripture* to a *Guide*, for the ending of their doubts; and *using ordinary industry* added, lest private men, jealous of not using their *utmost* industry to understand aright the *Scriptures*, should upon this account be perswaded, that it is safest for them to repair and adhere to a *Guide*] Next, *That, for all other Controversies, that arise in non-Necessaries, neither is it necessary, that they should be ended.* So that, as one briefly states the case||,——*Those places of Scripture, which contain things necessary, and wherein error were dangerous, need no infallible* [Judge, or] *Interpreter*, [or rather cannot but have every one an infallible Interpreter, upon supposition of a due diligence used], *becausе they are plain: and those that are obscure need none, because they contain not things necessary; neither is errour in them dangerous.* Or as another ||——*Of the true sence of plain texts every one may be certain, and for the obscure ones it is not necessary, every one should.* [And thus, having no living Judg to decide controversies, they make those controversies so much the fewer, that need deciding].

α.

|| *Chillingw.* p. 54.

|| See *Chilling.* p. 115. 92, 19. 58, 59. Pref. §. 30. *&c.* — Archbishop *Laud.* p. 156. n. 3. — *Stillingfl.* p. 149. — *Whitby* p. 441. — *Tillotſ.* Rule of Faith p. 20. 86.

|| *Chillingw.* p. 59.

|| *Tillotſ.* p. 86.

§. 39. n. 1.

And if we here further question; why all controversies in necessaries are affirmed to be clearly decided *in Scripture*? or, yet

more; why, so clearly decided there, as that even the unlearned cannot mistake in them? Mr. *Chillingworth* answers, they are so, *because* the Scripture *must be, to all, sufficiently perfect, and sufficiently intelligible, in all things necessary. And my reason hereof* (saith he) *is convincing, and demonstrative, because nothing is necessary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed.* [Which is granted him: But he must add; plainly revealed *in Scripture*; and plainly there *to the unlearned* also; otherwise it will not serve his purpose]. This Proposition therefore they also maintain; that all points necessary to salvation must be plainly revealed in Scripture to learned, and unlearned: and ground it on this reason; because God, who requires from all Christians, even the unlearned, belief of such necessaries, yet hath left them no other *certain* means of the knowledg thereof, save only the *Scriptures*‖. And, if it be replied here: That God hath appointed and referred them to a perpetual living Guide the Church, for the expounding and declaring to them the true sense of ambiguous Scriptures. Many things they object against it.

p. 92.

‖ See *Chillingw.* p. 171. *Whitby* p. 441.

§. 39. n. 2.

[ε] 1 st, they earnestly dispute; that this Guide, *the Church*, that they are referred to, is not infallible but that their's, the *Scripture*, is so. [γ] 2 dly they ask many questions about such Guide (as they conceive unanswerable) How, in a division of these living Guides, the unlearned may com to know, which are the *right*; and which is the true *Church*? Or, this found, how to know, what are her *definitions*, and *decrees*? what the *sence* of these decrees, &c? see many of them collected in 3 *Disc.* §. 86. contending, that the unlearned, in any such division of Guides, have no certain means to know the true from the false; nor the sence of their definitions more easily, than the sence of the Scriptures. 3. [δ] Lastly they say;‖ That, if God had left Christians in all Ages to learn Necessaries from their other Guides, he would at least, in the *Scriptures*, have directed Christians to repair to these *Guides*, for learning of them. [ε] And again, for the divisions hapning among these Guides, (well fore-seen by him), he would have told them in the Scriptures, what party, in such a case, they ought to follow, and adhere to; as, that they should always adhere to the *Church of Rome*; or, to the *Vicar of Christ*; or to the most *General Councils*; and, in dissenting votes here to the *major part* thereof, &c. And indeed this assertion that God hath left no other, *certain*, or *sufficient* means to any sort of Christians, since the Apostles times, whereby to attain the knowledge of *necessaries* to salvation, save only *the Scriptures*, seems to be the main pillar on which Mr. *Chillingworth*, and his followers sustain the

ε.

γ.

‖ See Mr. *Stillingfl.* p. 101. 508, &c. —*Chillingw.* p. 93. *Whitby* p. 430. &c.

δ.

‖ See Mr. *Chillingw* p. 61, 104, 171.

Pro-

Protestant Religion, and the Reformation ||.

|| See Chillingw. pref. §30. &c. comp. c. 2. §. 155. 156.

Before I return an answer to these, I have two things to note to you. 1st, That the devolving the decision of Controversies, not upon the *sufficiency* only, but upon the *clearnesse*, of the rule of *Scripture*, and declining any constant adhesion to the *Churches* judgment in the Exposition of it, seems not a little prejudicial to the Protestants cause; in that this is observed of old by *Tertullian*, *Austin*, *Vincentius Lirinensis*, and other Fathers ||, to have bin the way, that all former *heresies* have taken, declining the Church, and its Tradition, and pretending the Scriptures as the support of their Doctrines. §. 40. n. 1.

|| *Tertull. De præscriptione adversus Hæretic.* — *S. Aust.* Ep. 222. — *contra Maximinum. l.* 1 — *Vincent Lir.* c. 35.

[‘Of the old *Hereticks*, thus *Vincentius Lirinensis*, ——*Sive apud suos sive alienos*, &c. *nihil unquam penè de suis proferunt, quod non etiam Scripturæ verbis adumbrare conentur Lege Pauli Samosateni opuscula, Priscilliani Eunomii Joviniani, reliquarumque pestium; cernas infinitam Exemplorum congeriem; prope nullam omitti pagnam, quæ non novi, aut veteris testamenti sententiis fucata & colorata sit.* Then enquiring in this case ‖ ——‘*quoniam modo in Scripturis sanctis Catholici homines veritatem à falsitate discernent?* He answers ‖ ——*Hoc scilicet facere magnopere curabunt, ut divinum Canonem, secundum universalis Ecclesiæ Traditiones & juxta Catholici dogmatis regulas, interpretentur.*]

‖ *Contra Hæreses. c.* 35.

‖ c. 38.

And the same thing is also observable in that new-revived, most dangerous, Heresie of Socinianism; which draws up for it self, against Church-authority, much-what the same Plea, as is here above made by these Protestants some of which, that you may compare them, I have transcribed you here out of *Volkelius*, a little contracted. There then he saith, —— *Quæ de fido in Christum statuenda sunt, ex* sacris literis patere. *Charitatem quoque in* sacris literis *ita descriptam esse, ut quicunque eam ex animo colere, mentemque advertere velit*, ignorare non possit, *quid sibi sit in omnibus vitæ partibus sequendum; præsertim si* sapientiam *a Deo petat, quam ille nemini denegat* Again ——*Deum, qui religionem Christianam usque ad mundi finem vigere voluit, curasse etiam, tale aliquid* perpetuo extare, *unde ea, quatenus omnino ad salutem est necessarium, cognosci indubitatò possit; At nihil tale extare, præter* sacras literas. *Nam si dicas*, Ecclesiam *esse, unde ea cognitio semper peti possit: primum statuendum tibi erit, Deum etiam decrevisse, ut Ecclesia* vera (*falsa enim ad eam rem inepta est*) *semper usque ad mundi finem* extet. ——*Sed, ut Ecclesia vera extet, à quâ omnes salutaris*

|| *De vera Religione. l.* 5. c. 7.

taris veritatis notitiam indubitatò petere queant, requiritur, ut homines complures cœtum *aliquem, qui in omnium oculos incurrat, constituant*—— *At non est, quod quis* certam *aliquam* Ecclesiam *hoc privilegio a Deo donatam esse contendat, ut fide* excidere *nequeat. Deinde non posse* Ecclesiam *veram certo cognosci nisi prius cognoscatur, quæ sit salutaris Christi* doctrina——*præterea idipsum saltem debuisse alicubi in sacris literis* clarè *ac* perspicuè scriptum *extare, debere ab* Ecclesia *peti omnia, quæ ad salutem scitu sunt necessaria; & quænam ea sit Ecclesia, ac* unde *debeat cognosci, clare describi, ne quis in eâ cognoscenda facile errare posset. Nam si quippiam scriptu fuisset necessarium, hoc sane fuisset, sine quo reliqua omnia, quæ scripta sunt, nihil, aut parum admodum prodessent* ——*Denique eam Ecclesiam, quam isti* [Pontificii] *perpetuo extitisse volunt, constare, multis in rebus, atque adeo in iis quoque, quæ ad* salutem *sunt* necessariæ, *gravissime errare,* [Things usually pleaded by Mr. *Chillingw.* and his follow-

‖ See below §. 47. n.. ers, but whether borrowed from these I can say nothing‖] Thus the Socinians lay the platform of their Religion: and when the Protestants for confuting their errour, urge Fathers, and Church-authority against them, they reply, *That they have learnt this from them, to receive nothing besides Scripture, and to neglect the Fathers* ‖. Mean-while; Appeals of the Fathers, in Controversies of Religion, to the trial of the Holy Scriptures I acknowledge frequent; and that also somtimes, waving Church-authority ‖, but never made in opposition to it, former, or present. Their great humility (which also kept them Orthodox) hindred them from presuming this; and had any of them done it, posterity would not have stiled him a Father.

‖ See *Simlerus de Filio Dei, & S. Spiritu* Præfat.

‡ See S. *Austin* contra *Maximinum*, l. 3. c. 14.

§. 40. n. 2, 2. The second thing is, that, as to the *sufficiency*, or *intireness* of the Scriptures, for the containing all those points of faith, that are simply necessary of all persons to be believed for attaining salvation, Roman Catholicks deny it not; but only deny such a *clearness* of Scripture, in some of those, as Christians cannot mistake, or pervert. Catholicks contend indeed; that there are several things necessary to be believed by Christians, according as the Church, out of Apostolical Tradition, hath or shall declare, and propose them; (as, touching the *Government* of the *Church*: several *Functions* of the *Clergy*; *Administration* of the *Sacraments*, and some other sacred *Ceremonies*; and particularly concerning the *Canon* of the *Scriptures*), which are not contained in the Scriptures, at least, as to the clear mention therein of all those appertinents, which, yet, have bin ever observed in the Church. And touching the obligation of believing, and due

observing

observing of several of these *Traditions*, as descending from the Apostles, learned Protestants also agree with them ‖: and in particular, concerning the believing of the *Canon* of *Scripture*, though it be a thing not contained in Scripture. See Mr. *Chillingworths* Concession *p.* 55. ‖ where he saith, ——*That when Protestants affirm against Papists, that Scripture is a perfect Rule of faith, their meaning is not, that by Scripture all things absolutely may be proved, which are to be* believed; *For it can never be proved by Scripture to a Gain-sayer, that there is a God; or that the Book called Scripture is the Word of God. For he that will deny these Assertions, when they are spoken, Will believe them never a whit the more, because you can shew them written: But their meaning is; that the Scripture to them, that presuppose it divine, and a Rule of faith, (as Papists, and Protestants do), containes all the material objects of faith; is a compleat, and total, and not only an imperfect, and a partial, Rule.* Where in saying, *all material objects of faith*, he means only all other, after these he names presupposed, and pre-believed. But though (I say) Catholicks maintain several Credends, that are not expressed in Scriptures, necessary to be believed, and observed by Christians, after the Churches *Proposal* of them, as *Tradition Apostolical*, amongst which *the Canon of Scripture*; Yet they willingly concede, that all such points of faith as are simply necessary for attaining salvation, and as ought explicitly *by all men* to be known in order thereto, either *ratione medii*, or *præcepti*, (as the doctrines collected in the *three Creeds*; the *common* Precepts of *manners*, and of the more necessary *Sacraments*, *&c.*) are contained in the Scriptures; *contained therein*, either in the *Conclusion* it self; or in the *principles*, from whence it is necessarily deduced ‖. Therefore the Church, from time to time, defining any thing concerning such points, defines it out of the *Revelations* made in Scripture. And the chief *Tradition*, the necessity and benefit of which is pretended by the Church, is not the *delivering* of any *additional* doctrines, descended from the Apostles

‖ See Dr. *Field* of the Church *l.* 4. *c.* 20. — Dr. *Taylor* Episcopacy asserted § 19. — Reasons of the University of *Oxford* against the Covenant 1647. *p.* 9.

‖ See also p. 114.

‖ *Bellarmin.* de verbo Dei non scripto lib. 4. cap. 11. —— Illa omnia scripta sunt ab Apostolis, quæ sunt omnibus simpliciter necessaria ad salutem —— *Stapleton* Relect Princip Doctrinæ fidei Controver. 5. q. 5. art. 1 — Doctrinam fidei ab omnibus, & singulis explicitè credendam, omnem, aut ferè omnem, scripto commendarunt Apostoli. ——*The main and substantial Points of our faith*, (saith F. *Fisher* in Bishop *White* pag 12.) *are believed to be Apostolical, because they are written in cripture.*——*S.* Thom 22. q. 1. art. 9. primus, & ad primum—art. 10. ad primum——In Doctrina Christi, & Apostolorum [he means, Scripta] veritas fidei est sufficienter explicata; sed, quia perversi homines Scripturas pervertunt, ideo necessaria fuit temporibus proceden*tibus explicatio fidei* contra insurgentes errores.

times,

times *extra Scripturas*, i. e. such as have not their foundation at least in Scripture; but is the *preserving*, and delivering of the *primitive* sence, and Church-explication of that which is written in the Scriptures, but many times not there written so clearly. (which traditive sence of the Church you may find made use of against *Arianisme* in the first Council of *Nice* ‖)--Or, as Dr. *Field*-- *It is that forme of Christian doctrine, and Explication of the several parts thereof*, which *the first Christians, receiving of the same* Apostles, *that delivered to them the* Scriptures, *commended to posterity*. Thus he. This then being the Tradition, that is chiefly vindicated by the Roman Church, it is not the *deficiency* of Scripture, as to all the main, and prime, and universally necessary-to-be-known Articles of faith, as if there were any necessity that these be supplied, and compleated with other not written traditional Doctrines of Faith, that Catholicks do question: but the *non-clearness* of Scriptures (for several of these points) such, as that they may be miss-understood (which non-clearness of them infers a necessity of making use of the Church's tradition for a true exposition and sence), is the thing that they assert: and wonder, that, after the appearance of so many grievous Heresies, any should deny. For, as to the Scriptures containing all the *chief*, and *material* Points of a Christian's belief; what Article of Faith is there, except that concerning the *Canon* of *Scripture*, (which Protestants also grant cannot be learnt out of Scripture;) and excepting those *Practicals*, wherein, the Church only requiring a Belief of the Lawfulness of them, it is enough, if they cannot be shewed to be against Scripture; I say, what *Speculative* Article of Faith is there, for which Catholicks rest meerly on *unwritten Tradition*; and do not, for it, alledge Scripture; I mean, even that Canon of Scripture, which Protestants allow?

‖ See *Theod.* Hist *l.*1 c.8.
‖ Of the Ch. P. 375.

['A thing observed also by Dr. *Field* ‖ but too much extended——*This is so clear* (saith he); *That there is no matter of Faith* ['tis granted, no principal point thereof] *delivered by bare, and only Tradition; that, therein, the* Romanists *contrary themselves, endeavouring to prove by Scripture the same things they pretend to hold by Tradition, as we shall find, if we run through the things questioned between them and us*, [they contrary not themselves, in their holding several things to be delivered *clearly* by *Tradition*, which are also, but *obscurely*, or more evadably, contained in the words of *Scripture*] Again ‖——*So that for matters of Faith* (saith he) *we may conclude, according to the* judgment *of the best, and most learned, of our Adversaries themselves; that there is nothing to be believed, which is not either ex-*

‖ l. 4. c.20.
‖ *Ib.* p.877.

pressly

'*presly contained in Scripture, or at least by necessary consequence,* '*from thence, and by other things evident in the light of Nature, or* '*in the matter of Fact, to be concluded.* Thus he.]

I say then; not this, whether the main, or if you will, the entire, body of the Christian Faith, as to all points necessary by all to be explicitly believed, be contained there; but this, whether so clearly, that the unlearned, using a right diligence, cannot therein mistake, or do not need therein another Guide, is the thing here contested.

§. 41. R. to α. 1.

For a particular Reply then to what is here said. To α. 1st. I ask; if all Necessaries be clearly revealed, and all necessary Controversies clearly decided, in Scripture, even to the unlearned, how have Controversies in Necessaries (as concerning the *Trinity*, our *Lord's Deity*, and *Humanity*, &c.) in several Ages arose, and gained many *Followers*? Here, will they say; that such Controversies are not in Necessaries? How then came the first General Councils (extolled by Protestants) to put them in the *Creed*, or to exact *Assent* to them upon *Anathema*; which Councils they affirm in non-necessaries *fallible*; and in what they are fallible, unjustly imposing *Assent*? Or will they say, that they are in Necessaries; and that the unlearned may easily discern, and decide them; and that, not by Tradition, but only Scripture? How happened it then, that heretofore, so many, (learned, unlearned), when forsaking the *Church's* guidance, erred in them? But if they say, this hapned for want of a due diligence in the search of the Scriptures: thus they leave men in great perplexity, when the Scripture is *plain* (and only obscure to them through their negligent search); and so, when the point perhaps may be *necessary*. Thus an illiterate Christian not discerning from clear Scripture, whether *Sociniānisme*, or *Anti-Socinianisme* be the Catholick Faith, which he is very sollicitous to live, and die in; and consulting them concerning it, they tell him, there is no other director left him besides Scripture, whose Judgment he may *securely* follow (the judgment of the Church, or Councils here being waved by them, because this judgment allowed, or authorized, will infer the Belief of some other points which they approve not): Only this satisfaction they seem to leave him, that if neither side be *clear* to him in Scripture, neither much matters it, which side he holds for truth; For God say they, hath there, *clearly*, revealed all necessaries. But he enquiring further; whether they do not firmly believe *Anti-Socinianism*? and also ground their Faith of this upon the *Clearness* of Scripture in it?

it? And then: it appearing to them clear in Scripture how they know, but that it may be a neceſſary truth; and ſo his ſalvation ruined, if he believe the contrary? Here, what they can anſwer that will not more perplex him, I ſee not. Since ſo long as he may, poſſibly, fail in a *due diligence*, though only required according to his condition, he cannot be ſatisfied, whether the point, to every due Searcher, be not clear in Scripture; and alſo be not a *Neceſſary*. Nor yet will they allow him any other certain Director in it, but the ſame Scripture, which appears to him ambiguous.

‖ Ration. account. p. 58.

Hear what Mr. *Stillingfleet* interpoſeth in this matter—— *It ſeems reaſonable* (ſaith he ‖) *that, becauſe Art, and Subtilty may be uſed by ſuch, Who ſeek to pervert the Catholick Doctrine, and to wreſt the plain places of Scripture, which deliver it, ſo far from their proper meaning, that very few ordinary capacities may be able to clear themſelves of ſuch Miſts, as are caſt before their eyes; the ſence of the Catholick Church in ſucceeding ages may be a very* uſeful *way* [But, why not a *neceſſary Way*, I pray, upon the former ſuppoſal] *for us to embrace the true ſence of Scripture*, eſpecially in the great Articles of the Chriſtian Faith. *As for inſtance, in the Doctrine of the Deity of Chriſt, or the Trinity.* [Therefore you ſee in the greateſt Articles, Scriptures confeſſed not ſo plain, eſpecially to the unlearned, and ordinary capacities.]

§. 42. 2. 2ly, If all Neceſſaries ſo clearly revealed in *Scripture*; may we not ſo much the more ſecurely. and certainly rely on the judgment of our *Eccleſiaſtical Guides*, and Teachers in them; to whom they muſt needs be as, or more, plain, than to us; eſpecially, *on their Judgment*, when aſſembled in a *General* Council; on it, for theſe *Neceſſaries* at leaſt. It ſeems, no; and that the caſe is now altered. Even now; Neceſſaries were ſo plain in Scripture, as the unlearned, uſing ordinary diligence, could not miſtake in them. Now Neceſſaries are not ſo plain in Scripture, but that a General Council, as to the major part of them (the higheſt Authority by which the Church Catholick can direct us), at leaſt, if not in their ſence univerſally accepted, (for this Exception is put in by the more moderate ‖) may miſtake in them ſo far, as that the unlearned have, even for theſe Neceſſaries, no ſecurity to rely on their judgment.——*I muſt tell you* (ſaith Mr. *Chillingworth* to *F. Knot* ‖) *you are too bold in taking that, which no man grants you; that the Church is an infallible Director in Fundamentals* [or Neceſſaries.] Now this alſo he was (conſidering his Engagement) forced to ſay; and gives the reaſon that made

‖ See *Diſc.* 1. §. 32. &c.

‖ p. 150.

made him say so (I suppose for satisfying his own Party, rather than his Adversary) in the words following.——*For* (saith he) *if she were so; then must We not only learn Fundamentals of her; but also learn of her, What is fundamental, and take all for fundamental, which she delivers to be such.* And what harm in it, say I, if you did? Bur this, he well saw, would have destroyed the Reformation which was contrary to the Doctrines, which the publick *Director*, that was then in being, delivered. But. if these Necessaries, at the last, are not so few, or so plain in Scripture, but that the judgment of the Church-Guides, even when met, in their supreamest Consults, may err in them. will he allow us then to follow some other's *judgment*. that is, in these points *fallible?* If so; why not to follow *their's* still? But if not so; whose judgment will he direct us to, that shall less err than these Guides, or that shall certainly not err, in the undrstanding of these plain Scriptures. wherein these Guides mistake? Methinks he should * forbear here to name to us *our own* Judgment; even when we unlearned too; and yet none else can he name: And * much more forbear here to alledge *Passion*, *Faction*, *Interest*, &c, as great Blinders of this *publick* judgment, unless he could first shew the *private* not at all, or less, liable to them; which corrupters of a clear understanding seem indeed more incident to persons of a lower rank, and that have much relation to, and dependance on, others: and therefore what more common, than, for avoiding *those*, to make Appeals from inferior to a more general judgment, as expecting, in the most general, the most impartial dealing? And what private person can we produce, thot doth not range himself with some party; and that hath not, in matters controverted, a strong *secular Interest* for one side to be truth, rather than the other, according to the Church, and State he lives in?

But 3ly As it is necessary, that God, some way, or other, do *clearly* reveal to all, even the unlearned, using their due Industry, that which he requires *necessarily* to be believed by them; so it is not consequent at all, that God should do this, (as to every thing necessary) in the *Scriptures*. §. 43. 3.

First; Becaus *God* cannot be said to have been *deficient* in a competent revelation of Necessaries to all men, if he hath left, (as indeed he hath) sufficient evidence, and clearness in the Scriptures (that are first generally agreed on to be his Word), to every man *rightly* using his private judgment, or common reason, as to one point only; *viz.* this: *That it is his divine Will, that pri-* 1.

vate men, for all those Scriptures, the sence whereof is any way dubious, or controverted, should constantly be guided by, and adhere to, the judgment of those spiritual Superiors, *that he hath set over them; and, in any division of these, should still hold to the* Superiors *among these Superiors, according to the* Subordinations *by him established amongst them.* For thus we see, after a Christian's private judgment, or common reason used only in one point, for all other points *private* judgment is now discharged; and in stead thereof, obedience to *Authority* takes place, so far as its stating of any point thinks fit to restrain, therein, other mens Liberty of Opinion. The testimony of which Church-authority, as a thing clearly demonstrated and ratified by the Scriptures, S. *Austin*, in more difficult matters of Controversie, often appealed to. See *Disc.* 3. §. 82. n. 4.——*Puto* (saith he) *si aliquis Sapiens extitisset, cui Dominus Jesus Christus testimonium perhibet* [that we should be directed by his judgment]: *& de hac quæstione consuleretur à nobis; nullo modo dubitare deberemus id facere quod ille dixisset; ne non tam ipsi, quam Domino Jesu Christo, cujus testimonio commendatur, repugnare judicaremur. Perhibet autem testimonium Christus Ecclesiæ suæ.* And by this, (which is so often retorted by Protestants,) that Catholicks also are forced to allow to Christians the necessary use of their private Judgment, will be verified only in this *one* point, *The Choice, or the discerning of their Guide*; whereas the Protestants make it necessary for *all* Points; and who sees not a vast difference between these two, for the hazard which a Christian incurs therein, [1] The being, in *all controverted matters* of Religion, and sence of Scriptures, meerly cast upon his own reason, and skill, to steer himself aright therein. And [2] The being left to it only in *one* matter; and that one, as Catholicks contend, in the Scriptures very clear; after which, examined, and judged *by* him, all the rest, wherein he may want a resolution, are, without his further solicitude, to be judged *for* him, by another. So there is a great difference, when a person falls *sick*, between his being left to the use of his private judgment in making choice of a *Physitian*, according to certain Rules prescribed unto him by a wise, and experienced man in that behalf; and then, this once done, submitting himself afterward to this Physitian in all things, that he shall prescribe for his cure; and between this sick person's undertaking, by *Hippocrates* his Aphorisms, or other Physick Books, to prescribe all particular *Remedies* to himself, upon this reasoning: that if his private judgment serves for directing in the one, making choice of a *Physitian*: why not in all the other, fit *Medicines* for his Disease? Which Argument is only good, where

where all the Objects, about which our judgment is exercised, are equally easie, and clear to it: And therefore, unconsequently seems that Question to be asked ‖ ——[*If the Scripture may, and must decide one Point, that of the Church, Why may it not as well all the rest?*] If the Scripture be not in all other Points equally clear, and not-mistakable. This then is one way of sufficient Revelation, besides Mr, *Chillingworth's* way [I mean that, of all necessary Truths being clearly revealed in Scripture): *viz.* a sufficient Revelation of one point, in Scripture; concerning that *Guide*, from whom we may securely learn all the other points, not clear to us in Scripture.

‖ Stillingf. R. Ac. p. 7.

§. 44. 2. 2ly, Because *God*, *besides*, and *before*, the New-Testament *Scriptures*, left these doctrines sufficiently revealed to the then-appointed Ecclesiastical *Guides*; from whom both the present people, and the future successors of these Guides, both were, and might rationally know they were, to learn them; and so had there bin no Scriptures, might by *meer Tradition* have learned them sufficiently to this day for their Salvation. This is a second way then of sufficient Revelation, besides, or without that in Scripture: *viz.* All necessary Truth, *since* the penning of the Scriptures, only so manifested clearly to, and so delivered clearly by the *Church-Guides*, as they were manifested to them *before* Scripture.

3. 3ly. Because, as *all the Christian Doctrines* might, before, so, *the true meaning* of some part of the same *Scripture* might, after the writing allo of the New-Testament-Scriptures, have bin clearly enough delivered by Tradition, and by the first Scripture-Expositors, to the Christian people that were then, and so to Posterity, though, mean-while the Letter of such Scripture doth not so necessarily enforce this *traditive* sence, as not to be possibly, or somtimes probably, capable of another. This is a third way of sufficient Revelation: *viz.* by the clear descending *Tradition* of *the sence* of those Scriptures, which are in their *Letter* ambiguous.

§. 45. 4. But 4ly, Supposing it needful, that all such Necessaries must be *clearly* revealed *in the Letter* of Scripture; yet is this sufficient, to save God's proceedings from tyranny, if that they be with sufficient clearness revealed therein to the *Church Guides alone*, and to the *Learned*, that diligently read, and compare the Scriptures together, and use the helps of the comparings, and

comments of others; and if that the *illiterate* people be remitted by God, in all ages, to learn these Necessaries from their *Guides*. This is a fourth way of sufficient Revelation of Necessaries; *i.e.* a revelation of them in Scripture, such as must be clear to the *Church-Guides*; in stead of that other revelation, there, of Mr. *Chillingworth's*, such as must be clear to *all*.

§.46.n.1. R. to β.

To β. I answer, that where the sence of the Scripture is ambiguous, and in Controversie, (which *sence*, and not the *Letter* only, is God's Word) here their Guide to know this true sence of Scripture cannot be this, by all allowed infallible, Scripture, which Protestants pretend; but must be either the Church's judgment, which they say is fallible; or their own, which all reasonable men, I should think, will say, is more fallible.

R. to γ.

To γ. See many of their Questions solved, *Disc.*3. §. 86. and, concerning our understanding the sence of the Church's Definition better, than the sence of Scriptures. See below. §. 48.&c.

§. 46. n. 2. R. to δ.

To δ. 1st. It is not necessary, that God should direct Christians in this matter by the Scriptures; since they were sufficiently directed herein, also, before the Scriptures; (I mean, before the writing of those of the New-Testament); and since they might be sufficiently assured, from those, who were sent by our Lord to teach them Christianity, in this point also, *that* they were sent to teach them.

But 2ly. It is maintained that God in the Scriptures hath done this; and * hath told us‖——*That, he hath set these Guides in the Church, for the edifying, and perfecting thereof*; and for this in particular, *that the Church should not be tossed to, and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine* [with which *Winds* of *contrary* Doctrines, the Subjects of the Church, as Experience shews, from age to age, would have bin grievously shaken, and dissipated, but that these *Governors*, from time to time, by stating her Doctrines, have preserved her Children from it]. And * hath told us again‖——*That, the* unlearned *wrest some of the Scriptures* [that are plain it seems to the Learned, in that these wresters are the *unlearned*] *to their own* damnation. [therefore these are such Scriptures also, as speak concerning Necessaries].

§. 46. n 3. ‖Eph.4.11,&c.

‖2Pet.3.16

+

And * hath therefore given us a charge, *to obey these guides, to Whom is committed the Care of our Souls, and to follow their faith*‖

‖Heb. 13.7, 17.

* And declared——*that he, that heareth them, heareth him*

him ‖; add *that he will be with them to the end of the world*: especially *when gathered together* ‖; and would have the refractory to them *excommunicated* ‖. And, accordingly to this Warrant in *Scripture*, and (out of it), in *primitive Tradition*, the Church-Guides, from age to age, have met together; setled the Churches Doctrines; exacted Conformity; excommunicated Dissenters, &c,

‖ Luke 10.
‖ Mat. 18. 17, 20.
‖ Mat. 18. 17.

Next to ε. Where they say: That God foreseeing, that Divisions would happen among these Guides, would have told us in the Scriptures, which, in such case, among the several Parties of them, we ought always to follow, and adhere to: As: that we should adhere to the Church of *Rome*; to the *Vicar* of Christ; to the most *General Councils*, and, in dissenting Votes, to the *Major part* thereof, &c. To which purpose are those words of Mr. *Chillingworth* ‖——*If our Saviour, the King of Heaven, had intended that all Controversies in Religion should be, by some visible Judge, finally determined; who can doubt, but in plain terms he would have expressed himself about this matter? He would have said plainly*: The Bishop of *Rome* I have appointed to decide all emergent Controversies. *For, that our Saviour designed the Bishop of* Rome [I add, or a General Council] *to this Office, and yet would not say so, nor cause it to be written—ad rei memoriam—by any of the Evangelists, or Apostles, so much as once; but leave it to be drawn out of uncertain Principles, by* 13, *or* 14 *more uncertain Consequences, He that can believe it, let him.* And *p.* 104. He saith ——*It would have been infinitely beneficial to the Church, perhaps as much as all the rest of the Bible, that in some Book of Scripture, which was to be undoubtedly received, this one Proposition had been set down in terms*, The Bishops of *Rome*, with their Adherents, shall always be the Guides of Faith, &c. And *p.* 171. he argues thus——*Seeing God doth nothing in vain; and seeing it had been in vain, to appoint a Judge of Controversies, and not to tell us so plainly who it is; and seeing (lastly) he hath not told us plainly, no not at all, who it is; is it not evident, he hath appointed none?* ——See the same thing urged by Mr. *Stillingfleet*, Rat. Account, *p.* 465. And see all this as it were translated only out of the *Socinian* Books, before, §. 40. n. 1.

§. 47. n. 1. R. to ε.

‖ p. 61.

To this 1*st*, I answer: That *negative* arguing from *Scripture*, such as this [a thing of so great concernment to all Christians, if it were true, would have bin clearly expressed in the Scripture, but this is not found clearly expressed therein, there-

§. 47. n. 2. 1.

therefore it is not true,] as it is very plausible, and much used, especially against *Church-authority*; so is it very fallacious: by which the more *Orthodox* party of *Protestants* also have suffered much from several *Sects*. Whenas it cannot be denied; that there are many things, granted most true; and of most high concernment, which are, for those excellent ends of Gods infinite wisdom which we cannot fully discern, nor so clearly expressed there, for preventing disputes, as they might have bin.

Our *Saviours* Sermon made (partly, at least) concerning the Eucharist, (amply set down in the 6*th*. of *S. John*, and therefore perhaps mention of the *Eucharist* omitted afterward by that Evangelist in the Story of his passion) was delivered by him in some expressions so obscure, as that (as St. *Austin* observes) not only his enemies, the blinded Jewes, but his own *disciples* misunderstood it, and some of them deserted him upon it, calling it *durus Sermo*: and yet saith that Father‖——*Sic oportebat, ut diceretur, quod non ab omnibus intelligeretur.* And what contentions, and also persecutions, think we, might a declaration of the *abrogation* of *Circumcision*, and the *Mosaical Ceremonies* have saved in the *Apostles* times, if it had been any where delivered expressly by our *Lord*, (who well foresaw those troubles) in the Gospel he preached? Or what contentions would the *Athanasian Creed* have prevented in the times that followed, had it been written *verbatim* in one of S. *Pauls* Epistles; or had the points of *modern Controversie* bin set down, there, in as expresse termes, as they are in a Protestant-*Catechism*, in the 39. *Articles*, or in the *Council* of *Trent*. If we will give humane wisdom (in respect of which *God's Wisdom* is often thought *foolishnesse*) liberty to devise what is best, or fittest, had it not bin much more to purpose for *Conversion* of the *Iews* to Christianity, that our Lord, upon his Resurrection, should have openly manifested himself to all the Nation, at that great Festival, on the top of the Temple, with a Trophee of victory in his hands? And, for the salvation of mankind (God-willing, *that all should be saved*‖), had it not bin better to have made the divel at first close prisoner, and prevented the temptation of *Eve*, and fall of *Adam*? Hear Mr. *Chillingworth* himself, where it concerned him, reprove the folly of such arguing:——*In humane reason* (saith he‖) *it were incomparably more fit, and useful, for the decision of Controversies, that the Apostles Successors should do miracles; will you now conclude they have the Gift of doing miracles?——It had been most requisite (one would think) that the Copies of the Bibles should have bin preserved*

‖ In Iohan. Tract. 27.

1 Cor. 1. 23, 25.

1 Tim. 2. 4.

‖ P. 103.

feer

free from variety of reading, which makes men very uncertain in many places, which is the Word of God, and which is the error, and presumption of man; and yet, we see, God hath not thought fit so to provide for us. Who can conceive, but that an Apostolick Interpretation of all the difficult places of Scripture, would have bin strangely beneficial to the Church, especially there being such danger in mistaking the sence of them, as is by you pretended, &c. And yet we see God hath not so ordered the matter. Thus Mr. *Chillingworth.*

Supposing then, that a General Council, or the Bishop of the prime Apostolick See were constituted by God the Supreme and Final Judge of Controversies in Religion, and of all Appeals from inferior Ecclesiastical Courts: yet Gods wisdom might think meet not to register this, in these or the like short and clear expressions, in Scripture, for many excellent reasons tending to the manifestation of his *greater* glory, who makes *darkness* as well as *light*, to bring light out of darkness; and leaves many arguments of contradiction to humane *reason*, the more to shew the power of the operation of his grace; who discloseth the things belonging to our salvation, somtimes with more, somtimes with lesse, evidence, (yet this always sufficient) for the necessary preserving of *truth*, on the one side; and for the exercise, and greater merit of *faith*, on the other.

See Disc. 1. § 16. +

But 2ly, to come closer to the matter in hand. God hath in the Scriptures not only left a General Command of following their Guides ‖, but also sufficiently directed Christians to know, in any division of these Ecclesiastical Guides, which are those they ought to follow, in that he, being in all things the Author not of confusion, but of order, and peace ‖, hath not left these Guides in the Church without a due *subordination*, from the very first, and Apostolical, times; and also hath authorized the Church-Governors, to make afterwards such wholesom laws, for the Regency, peace, and unity thereof, as do justly, and unappealably, oblige all inferiors, and subjects. Hence there is not wanting both Precept and Example sufficient, both in the Holy Scriptures, and primitive Church-constitutions, and practice, whereby the inferior Clergy are subjected to the Superior; and a part unto the whole Body; *i.e.* one, or a few parts to the many parts; or to all the rest of the Body); and by this also is our obedience directed, whenever an inferior, and a Superior; a part, and the whole, differ: Nor can any justly raise a dispute; in this divided Body, whom they should obey, when both the *Number*, and *Primacy*, are unequal. See to these things what is said before,

§ 47. n. 3. 2.

‖ See before § 46. n. 3.

‖ 1 Cor. 14 33

Prop.

Prop. 12. §. 23.——And 1. *Disc.* §. 15.——Therefore: In a division between any single Guide, and that Corporation of them whereof he is a member, this body justly claims both the Laicks and that Guide's obedience. As the decree of the whole in the *Acts* || was to be obeyed by the *Antiochians*, before the orders of one, or a few members of it, that were zealous of the Law, though these should have bin the proper *Pastors*, and *Guides* of the Church of *Antioch*, because of the subordination of these Pastors to the other supreme Representative of the Church. And again, in any great division hapning in this *Body* it self, our obedience follows the fuller Body of them still; which, in respect of the rest being fewer, bears the name of the *whole*; Especially, when the *supremest* Ecclesiastical Governor that is upon earth, the chief President of this Body, joynes with it, (upon which terme, only obedience to these Guides is demanded feom those of the *Reformation.*) Thus it is, before that any be excluded, by heresie, from this Body: But when any, in its former lawful Councils, are so cut off, then our obedience follows the fuller Body of them, these other, how numerous soever afterward, excepted.

Act. 5.

§. 48.

Now this *fuller* Body at this day, joined with the *chief* Pastor of Christs Sheep here on earth, if any one seeketh after, for his safe conduct to future happinesse, he cannot but discern it from all other Christian *Societies*, that pretend to guide him. And, this found; again he, using the ordinary care of persons desiring instruction, cannot but come to know its *Councils*, and their *definitions*, its doctrines, and Laws, (which, we find, as the Leaders of all Sects do theirs, so those of the Church Catholick are studious to divulge, and publish), so far as, they are by him, considering his condition, necessary to be known, and the profession, or practice thereof, required of him.

For Example: In the Church of *England*, who is there using the ordinary care necessary in matters of his salvation, that first cannot easily discern this *Church*, from the several other later, and unheaded *sects*, that are in this Kingdom? and, this Church known, who may not easily attain, therein, to a knowledg also of its *Articles* of *Religion*, and *Canons*, its *Synods*, or *Convocations*, delivered by the common Tradition, and by the Church-Guides, and publick Writings daily inculcated, so far as the understanding of them is to him necessary. The same evidence therefore in these things must be allowed not to be wanting to those, who have once found, among the many Societies of Christians, that Church, which is their right Guide.

And

§. 49.

And litle reaſon have the reformed to affirm a neceſſity, that all Neceſſaries ſhould be made moſt evident, even to the unlearned, in the Scriptures, if aſſerted on this account, becauſe ſuch people have no means of attaining any certain knowledge of them from the *Miniſtry* of the *Church*. And with litle reareaſon ſeem Mr. *Stillingfleet* and others to affirm (which yet is uſed by many late Proteſtant-Writers, as a main ground of evacuating the authority of the Church) * that it is no eaſier a thing to know, what the *Church* defines, than what *Scripture* determines, and, *That the ſame Arts, that can evade the texts of Scripture, will equally elude the Definitions of Councils*; [as if all writings were equally plain, or equally obſcure; or, if none free from, therefore all equally liable to, cavils]; Again: *That the Argument of the willingneſs of all Proteſtants to ſubmit their judgments to Scripture, will hold as well (or better) for their unity; as that of the readineſs of all thoſe of the Church of *Rome* to ſubmit their judgments to the ſence, and determination of the Church. will hold for their unity: And this unity to be effected by the Scriptures he ſpeaks of, as to thoſe matters, wherein the *ſence* of the ſame Scriptures is *controverted* amongſt Chriſtians; for in ſuch only it is, that Chriſtians for their unity ſeek to the *deciſions* of the *Church*. [As if they undertook to defend this: That a living Judge, ſet up for the expounding of the dubious places of the Law, to the ſentence of which Judg all are agreed to aſſent, yet is no more effective for ending controverſies about the ſenſe of the Laws, and for uniting parties; than the Laws themſelves are without ſuch Judge,] Mr. *Stillingfleets* words are, ||——*Your great Argument for the unity of your party; becauſe, Whatever the private opinions of men are, they are ready to ſubmit their judgments to the cenſure and determination of the Church; if it be good, Will hold as well (or better) for our unity, as yours, becauſe all men are willing to ſubmit their judgments to Scripture, which is agreed on all ſides to be infallible. If you ſay, that it cannot be known, What Scripture determines, but it may be eaſily, what the Church defines. It is eaſily anſwered, that the event ſhews it to be far otherwiſe; for how many diſputes are there concerning the power of determining matters of faith; &c?* [concluding thus.] *ſo that upon the whole it appears, ſetting aſide force and fraud, (which are excellent principles of Chriſtian unity) we are upon as fair termes of union, as you are among your ſelves.* Where; doth he not ſay this in effect; that the true Church being known, and its authority granted infallible (as that of the Roman Church is, by its ſubjects) Yet, we can no more know, what this

* Tillotſ. Rule of faith p. 21.

|| p. 101.

Church defines (ſuppoſe what the Church of *Rome*, or of *England* defines concerning Tranſubſtantiation, St-Invocation, Sacrifice of the Maſs, &c.) than what Scripture determines concerning theſe points; and that *Canons*, *Catechiſms*, *&c.* authorized by a Church, can no further clear any point to us, than *Scripture* did formerly; and that only the Church is ſo unfortunate, in her publick interpretations of Scriptures, that her Expoſitions are no plainer, than the Texts; and that only force, or fraud unites her ſubjects in their opinions? And, if ſo; what fault hath the Council of *Trent* made, in its *new* definitions, if, after theſe, it ‖ Stillingf. p. 102. ſeems || there is as much diviſion, (and then liberty alſo) of opinions, as was before them? ‖ Why do they accuſe its *decrees*, as plain enough, but erroneous; and not invalidate them rather, as dubious, and uncertain? Why diſpute they not, whether theſe, we have now extant, be its genuine Acts? Would it not be advantageous to the reformed, to ſhew, that this Council makes nothing againſt them? In ſuch unreaſonable Conteſts hath Mr. *Chillingworth*, by inventing many captious queſtions to weaken Church-authority, engaged his followers. As if, though Catholicks allow ſeveral things in Councils obſcurely delivered; ſome proceedings in ſome things unjuſt; the legality of ſome Councils diſputed, &c, yet there could not remain ſtill enough *clear* and *unqueſtionable* both of Councils, and their Canons, both * to eſtabliſh the moſt illiterate ſubjects of the Catholick Church in all ſuch, as is thought *neceſſary*, faith, (whoſe obligation is not to believe all things defined, but all things ſufficiently propoſed to them to be ſo); and * to overthrow the paſt Reformation.

The

THE
THIRD DISCOURSE.

CHAP. I.

Roman-Catholicks and Protestants agreed. 1. *That the Scriptures are God's Word.* §. 1. 2. *That in these Scriptures (agreed on) it is clearly declared; that the Church, in no age, shall err in Necessaries.* §. 2. 3. *That the Church-Catholick is contra-distinct to Heretical, and Schismatical Churches.* §. 4. 4. *That Christ hath left in this Church Pastors and Teachers, to keep it from being tossed to and fro, and carried about, with every wind of Doctrine.* §. 5.

1st. BOth *Roman Catholicks*, and *Protestants* are agreed; *That there is sufficient certainty, in the* General Tradition *of the Catholick Church descending to the present Age; that the Bible, or Holy Scriptures, are the Word of God.* §. 1.

2ly. They are agreed. *That it is clearly declared in these Scriptures, that, the* Catholick Church, *in no age, shall err in Credends, or Practicals* necessary *for obtaining Salvation.* §. 2.

From which Christians seem to be secured; That, in their approving, and conforming to what is granted generally to be held by the Church-Catholick, (of any age whatsoever), they shall incur no Error, or Practice, destructive of Salvation. Whereas a hazard herein may be, in their departing from the Doctrine, or Practice, of the Church-Catholick, or of all the particular §. 3.

ticular Churches, of any age; all, or some of which must be the Catholick.

§. 4. 3ly, Learned *Protestants* consent with *Roman* Catholicks ‖, *That*, the Holy Catholick Church (*which we believe in our Creed*) *is a visible Church in all ages, consisting of* Pastors *as well as* People, *in external Profession, and Communion contradistinct to Heretical, and Schismatical Churches, when such there happen to be in any age.* See before, *Disc.* 2. §. 5.

‖ *Hooker* p. 124.---- *Field* l. 1. c. 10. p. 14. 15. --*D. Fern. Divis. Engl. Rom.* §. 10---- Archb. *Lawd* p. 140.

§. 5. 4ly. They are also agreed: *That, Christ hath left in this Church-Catholick these* Pastors, *and* Teachers *to the end of the world, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ; that we may not be tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine, by the slight of men.* ‖ Thus far they agree.

‖ Eph. 4. 11, 14.

CHAP. II.

Roman Catholicks further affirming 5. *That, the Church-Guides, at least assembled in Lawful General Councils, shall never err in their determining Points of necessary Faith.* §. 6.

6. *Points necessary, not as taken onely for, those absolutely required, but all very beneficial, to Salvation.* §. 9. 7. *shall never err in them; not as infallibly inspired to teach any new, but as divinely assisted in delivering of the former, Revelations and Traditions.* §. 10. 8. *That, for knowing, what, or how many of former Councils have been lawfully General, or Obliging, a Christian may safely rely on the most general judgement of the Church, since the sitting of such Councils.* §. 11. 9. *That, in the absence of a considerable part of the Church-Governors from some Councils, yet their acceptance of its decrees, or concurrence with its Doctrines renders it equivalent to a Council General.* §. 13. 10. *That, particular, Persons, or Churches, Parts of the whole, are obliged to submit their judgement to the Decrees, and Definitions of the whole.* §. 14.

BUt, here, the two Parties divide, in their Superstructions.

§. 6. For 5ly. The *Catholicks* go on, and affirm further; *That these*

these Pastors, *and* Governors *of the Church, at least when assembled in a* Lawful General Council (*or in so general, as the present times of the Church, according to the several Requisites of such great meetings, are well capable of*) *universally accepted,* (I mean in the sence before explained, *Disc.*1. §. 31, 36, 38. And below §. 12.) *shall never err in their Determinations, or teaching of Credends, and Practicals necessary for obtaining salvation: and therefore that Christians, in their assenting to such Determinations, remain secure from all such Errors.*

§. 7. First. The *Reason,* why the *Teachers* are affirmed, *thus, unerrable,* is [1] Because most of those places in *Scripture,* from which is gathered the Church's Indefectibility, or inerrability in Necessaries (*Prop.*2.) [as *Mat.*16.18.---- 18. 17. --- comp. 20. ---- 28. 20. ---- *John* 14. 16. ---- 1 *Tim.*3. 15.---- *Luke* 10. 16.---- *Eph.* 4. 11, 14.] do appear to relate, more especially to these *Guides* thereof, than to the *Common* people. And, [1] Because, this seems no more than necessary, Since God hath required nothing to be externally *professed* by us as Truth, or *acted* by us, in obedience to Command, but what our Judgement, or Conscience first internally assents to, as *Truth,* and as *Lawful*; It seems (I say) no more than necessary, that, in the many doubts which may arise, especially to the more ignorant sort, both in *Credends* and *Practicals,* there be some sure and unfailing Directors of these our interior Judgements herein, as to all Necessaries: which Director, in such doubts, can neither be the Scripture, the sence of which is ambiguous unto us, and the thing wherein we seek direction; nor yet is the Civil Magistrate, in these spiritual Matters, but only the Ecclesiastical: to whose *Guidance of Souls* also, we are committed, and enjoyned Obedience. *Heb.*13.17,7. (See, before, §. 5.---- And *Disc.* 2. §.4. *Chillingw.*)

§. 8. 2. Next. The *Reason,* why these *Guides* are affirmed *unerring,* at least, when joyned in a *General Council* is; because

1*st.* It cannot reasonably be questioned; but that, what authority every one of them *singly* hath from our Lord, the same all of them retain in this Body *united,* without the need of any new Commission from the Church-*Catholick.* 2*ly.* Because, if there be any Promise, made to them in any capacity, of indeficiency in Necessaries; then, of all manners, or ways deviceable wherein they may be so, it is in this *Conjuncture* of them, and that the most universal that can be procured (used in all ages, as the *Supreme* Court of *Appeals*), that they appear to be most capable

thereof, and least liable to defect‖. In which the Catholicks are also * confirmed, by the *Apostolick* practice in the *Acts* ‖, where, for solving a great difficulty, they called an *Assembly* of the Church-Governors, and passed some *Decrees* therein, to which all particular Churches, and their Pastors stood obliged. Seeming (there) to fortifie their Authority with these two Expressions, *Visum est Spiritui Sancto, & nobis* (v. 28.) And ---- *Nobis γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν, collectis in unum.* v. 25. As also the Holy Ghost descended on them at first (*Acts* 2. 1.) when so *assembled*. To which *Assembly* also the great *Apostle* St. *Paul*, notwithstanding that his Doctrine was immediatly revealed to him by our Lord Jesus, and confirmed to others, by his Miracles, yet was sent by God's immediate appointment, (for he saith, he went to this *Council* by *Revelation*, Gal. 2. 2.): that so his Doctrine might both be the more authorized to his Auditors; and his Converts more readily obey it, (and so he *not run in vain*, nor lose his labour), when they knew it to be confirmed, and established by this *General Council* [With which, thus, *Theodoret* begins his Epistle to *Leo*.—— *Si Paulus præco Veritatis, Tuba sanctissimi Spiritus ad magnum Petrum cucurrit; ut iis, qui Antiochiæ de Institutis Legalibus contendebant, ab ipso afferret solutionem; multo magis nos, qui abjecti sumus, & Pusilli, ad Apostolicam sedem vestram currimus, ut Ecclesiarum ulceribus Medicinam, a vobis, accipiamus,*—— And St. *Austin* ‖ —— *Ipse Apostolus Paulus, post ascensionem Domini, de Cœlo vocatus, si non inveniret in carne Apostolos, quibus communicando, & cum quibus conferendo Evangelium, ejusdem Societatis esse appareret, Ecclesia illi omnino non crederet. Sed cum cognovisset, eum hoc annunciantem, quod etiam illi annunciabant, & in eorum communione, atque unitate viventem,* &c. *meruit authoritatem*, &c. And again * confirmed by the *Primitive* Practice, afterward, in the first General Councils universally allowed; who required *Assent* under *Anathema* to their Definitions; and inserted them, as it was thought meet, into the *Creeds*: which sufficiently declares, that they held themselves *infallible*, or (which is all that is here meant by it) actually unerring, therein.

‖ See Mat. 18. 17, 20. 1 Cor. 5. 4, 15.--- See below §. 94.

‖ Act. 15. 2, 6.

‖ Contra Faustum. l. 28. c. 4.

3ly. When any Division happens in this collective Body; it being certain, that some *Clergy* for ever must be so *infallible* (the Church-Catholick being ever so; and never consisting of *People* only, without *Pastors*); It is necessarily devolved also upon the much *major*, and *more-dignified*, part of this united Body of the Clergy to be *so*: Because else, the Catholick Church would not be *One* in its Constitution; but a Body divided in it self, and so, which could not stand, if two

seve-

several Parties in such Council, without any just *subordination* to one another, might both pretend themselves to be the *unerring Guide*.

§. 9.

6ly. For these Church-Guides being affirmed unerrable in Necessaries, *Catholicks* here do understand *Necessaries, not in so strict a sence, as to be restrained, and limited only to those few points of Faith, that are so indispensably required to be of all explicitly believed, as that salvation is not possibly consistible with the disbelief, or ignorance, of any of them:* But affirm; *they ought to be understood in a sence more enlarged; comprehending at least, all such points as are very requisite, and beneficial to salvation, either in respect of Christian* Faith, *or* Manners; *either for the direction of particulars, or Government of the whole Society of Christians.* (Of which see what is spoken more largely in the 2d. *Disc. §. 9.*)

§. 10.

7ly. Concerning the particular *Manner*, or *Measure*, of these Church-Governors, when assembled in a lawful General Council, their being affirmed *unerrable*, or *infallible*.

1st. As *Catholicks* do not hereby understand *them absolutely unerrable in any matter whatever, which they may attempt to determine; but only in such matters as appear to them of necessary Faith, taken in the sence before-mentioned*‖; So neither do they hold, *touching these necessary points*, * *any inherent habitual infallibility, residing either in the whole Council, or some Members thereof, whereby they perceive, and know themselves infallibly inspired, as to such points; after the same manner, as the Apostles, or Prophets did; but only* * an actual non-erring *in those things, which they define*; * *from the promised* Divine Assistance, *and super-intendent Providence constantly directing their Consultations into the Truth, (by what several ways, or means, it matters not to know): or also* * *from the* clear Evidence *of former Revelation, and Tradition of the point defined: from which Evidence* Protestants *also grant, that those may be certain for* some *divine Truths, who are not infallible in* all.

‖ §. 9. & Disc. 2. §. 9.

2ly. Catholicks affirm, *These Guides, in all ages, since that of the Apostles,* equally *infallible: and that the present Church doth not, or may not, pretend to any infallibility; or exercise any authority consequent thereof, which the ancient Catholick Church did not claim, and also practise, in the four first, or other General Councils. But yet; as this* ancient *Church also required Assent under* Anathema *to its Definitions, and inserted some of them into the Creeds; and some of these also points of great difficulty, and subtle discussion; that so may the* present, *or the* future *Church do the like.*

8ly. Catho-

§. 11. 8ly. *Catholicks* affirm. *That, of the several Councils that have been assembled in former ages, to know which, or how many, of them have been lawfully general; or in their obligation equivalent thereto; any Christian* (without going about to satisfie himself in all those curious Questions, moved by Protestants; several of which are considered, below. §. 86. &c.) *may securely relie on the acceptation, and acknowledgement, or non-opposition, of them, and their Decrees, * by the Church-Catholick, of that age, wherein they were held, and of the ages following*; i. e. *by the Teachers, and Writers therein unanimously maintaining, or not gainsaying the Doctrines of such Councils; and, by the Church's practice, conforming to their Injunctions: Or, where some persons, or Churches dissent from the rest, * by the* Major part *of these Churches accepting them, when these are united also with St.* Peter's *Successor, (the always Prime Patriarch, and Supreme Bishop of the Christian world), the Bishop of* Rome.

As for Example; *Catholicks* hold; that a Christian may securely embrace, and obey the Decrees of those Councils as Generall; or, in their obligation, equivalent thereto, the Decrees whereof were *accepted* by the *whole* Church-Catholick (tacitly at least, in their Liturgies, Writings, Practices, being conformable thereto, or not dissenting therefrom,) at the Appearance of *Luther*, and are accepted still, both by the much major part of the Christian world; and also ratified by the Supreme Pastor of the Church-Catholick.

§. 12. The *Reason* of this. 1 Because, if a Christian may not securely rely on such an *Acceptation*, a few persons, or Churches, resisting, or standing out (perhaps those who are condemned also of *Heresie*, and *Schism*, by *such Councils*); This will void the obligation of all Councils whatever. And, upon the same termes the *Arrian Bishops*, and their *Churches*, that dissented, will void the Obligation of the *first* General Council of *Nice*; and those dissenting Persons, and Churches of the *Nestorians*, and *Eutychians*, or *Dioscorites*, (some of which continue in the Eastern, or Southern parts of the world unto this day) will void that of the third, and fourth General Councils of *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*. (See more of this, *Disc.* 2. §. 25. &c.)

And 2 Because, considering the nature of a multitude, such thing can hardly be, but that some will dissent from the rest; and therefore it seems as necessary to proceed according to the same Rule in the Church-Catholick's *accepting* the Council's Decrees, as in the Council's *making* them, [*viz.* that the Vote of the *much*

much major part conclude the *whole*,] to render the actions of such great *Bodies* valid.

9ly. Concerning the Acceptation of Councils by the whole, or major part of the Church-Catholick, this seems reasonable; *That, though the representatives of some considerable part of the Church-Catholick should be wanting in some of these Councils,* (especially when they are assembled for deciding some Controversies arising only in that part of Christianity, where the Council sits); *yet the certain concurrence of that absent part of the Church-Catholick, in their doctrines, with the decrees of such Councils, should pass for a sufficient acceptation of them; and such absence no way prejudice the obligation of such Decrees.* For it may well be presumed, the members of such Churches, if present, would have voted in the Council, what they hold, out of it; hold, before it; contradict not, after it. §. 13.

10ly. Catholicks *do hold, all particular persons, and Churches, taken* divisim, *as being only a part of, and subordinate to, the whole*‖, (*as also all particular Bishops are only single members of the whole Body of them, assembled in a Council*), *to stand obliged in submission of their judgement, and in obedience of assent, to the Definitions and Decrees of the whole, in these Supremest Courts thereof, wherein it can give its judgement,* viz. *its lawful General Councils; when these accepted also by the Church-Governors absent, in the manner forementioned.* §. 14. ‖ See Disc. 2. §. 23.

The *Reason*, Because these Supreme Courts are secured for ever by our Lords Promise, that they shall not err, or misguide the Churches subjects in Necessaries, (§. 6, 7.) I mean Necessaries taken in the sence above explained, 2 *Disc.* §. 9. And next: because, *what*, or *how much*, is to be accounted, thus, necessary, the judgement of this belongs also to these Church-Governors, not their subjects; as is shewed before 2. *Disc.* §. 6, 7. §. 15.

CHAP. III.

R. *Catholicks proceeding to affirm* 11. *That all persons dissenting from, and opposing, any known Definition of the Church, in a matter of Faith, are Hereticks* §. 16. 12. *All persons sepa-*

separating, on what pretence soever, from the external Communion of the Church-Catholick, Schismaticks §.20. But yet: that difference of Opinions or Practices between co-ordinate Churches, may be without Heresie or Schisme on any side; where no obligation to these lying on both, from their common Superiors, or from the whole §.23.

§.16. 11ly. TOuching the two great Crimes of *Heresie* and *Schisme*, dividing such persons, or Churches, as are guilty thereof, from the Catholick, Church, and Communion (See before Prop.3. §.4.) 1st, For *Heresie:* the *Catholicks* affirm, *That any particular, Person, or Church, that maintains, or holds the contrary to any to him made-known Definition (passed in a matter of faith,) of any lawful General Council; (i.e. of those Councils, that are accepted by the Church-Catholick in the sence,* ‖See §.12. *mentioned before‖, as such), is Heretical:* [Not medling here; whether some others also, besides these, for the opposing some Doctrines clearly contained in Scripture, or generally received, by the Church, and such as are by all explicitly to be belived, may be called so.] 2ly. They affirm, *That those may become Hereticks in holding an error in the faith* after *the Churches Definition of such a Point, who were not so,* before.

§.17. Where, The *Reason,* why the certain judgement of *Heresie*; is made not from the testimony of Scripture, but of the Church; and why all holding of the contrary to such definition known is pronounced *Heresie,* though sometimes the same error, before it, was not so; is, because no Error in Faith can be *judged Heresie,* but where there appears some *Obstinacy,* and *Contumacy* joyned thereto. Neither can such Obstinacy, and Contumacy appear, especially as to some Points of Faith, from the *Scriptures*; because the sence of Scripture, as to some matter of Faith, may be, as to some persons, *ambiguous,* and not *clear.* But the sence of the Church, (or her General Councils), which is appointed by God the Supreme Expositor, and Interpreter of the sence of the Scriptures, that are any way doubtful, and disputed, is so *clear,* as that any rational or disintereſſed person, to whom *it,* and the *authority* delivering it, and the *divine assistance* of that authority, are proposed, according to the evidence producible for them, can neither deny her just authority over him; nor her veracity, and her Exposition of Scripture clearly against him: who yet cannot see, or at least hath not the same cogent evidence to acknowledge

acknowledge, the *Scripture*, in such point, to be so: and so, such person will thenceforth become in this sence αὐτοκατάκριτος, and self-convinced: and, if others happen, by their contracted fault, not to be so, their guilt, in general at least, is not lessened, but aggravated thereby. Therefore the *Apostle* writes to Bishop *Titus*: that, after a second Admonition, he should reject a man *Heretical*, or still adhering to his own Opinion, *knowing that such a one sinneth, being self-condemned.* [*viz.* that he disobeyeth the doctrine of the Church, concerning which Church he either hath, or might have, sufficient evidence, that he ought to believe Her] And our *Lord* commands: that he, who, in matters controverted, *refuseth to hear the Church*, should be withdrawn from, by the Christian, *as a Heathen, or Publican* was by the Jew. Thus, it seems by these *Texts*, is *Heresie* known, and Hereticks to be rejected. Tit. 3. 10.

§. 18.

And the *Fathers* also are frequent in declaring those to be *Hereticks*, who, after the Church *Definition*, continue to retain an opinion contrary thereto; whereas, themselves or others, in holding the same Opinion before such Definition, were not so. Thus St. *Austin* ‖ --- *Qui in Ecclesiâ Christi morbidum aliquid, pravumque sapiunt, si, correpti* [(*i*) by the Church], *ut sanum, rectumque sapiant, resistunt contumaciter, suaque mortifera, & pestifera dogmata emendare nolunt, sed defensare persistunt, hæretici* fiunt. [It seems, one holding *dogma pestiferum & mortiferum* before the Churches correption, may be no Heretick; who, yet, is so after it] And elsewhere of the *Donatists* he saith ‖ --- *Post causam cum eo* [Cæciliano] *dictam atque finitam, falsitatis rei deprehensi*, pertinaci *dissentione firmatâ, in* hæresim, *schisma verterunt*; *tanquam Ecclesia Christi, propter crimina Cæciliani--- de toto terrarum orbe perierit --- Audent etiam rebaptizare Catholicos, ubi se amplius* Hæreticos *esse firmarunt*; *cum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ universæ placuerit, nec in ipsis hæreticis baptisma commune rescindere*, [Where observe, that they are charged by this Father for *Heresie* (which *Hereticalness* of theirs Protestants would fain divert to other matters) in the point of *rebaptization*; and that, because this point now setled by the Church] And so *Vincent Lirinen*, ‖ —— *O rerum mira conversio! Auctores ejusdem opinionis* Catholici; *consectatores vero* hæretici, *judicantur: absolvuntur magistri, condemnantur discipuli*, &c. [the wonder here is, that, in holding the self-*same* opinion, the one are not *Hereticks*, the other are; *i. e.* after a General Council had condemned the Tenent]. Again St. *Austin* ‖ gives *Quod-vult-Deus*, for avoiding Heresies, this General Rule

‖ De Civ. Dei l. 18. c. 51.

‖ De Hæresibus.

‖ c. 11.

‖ D. Hæresibus.

---- *Scire, sufficit, Ecclesiam contra aliquid sentire, ut illud non recipiamus in* fidem. [It seems this was a Principle with the Father ---- *Nihil recipiendum in fidem*, or, *credendam, contra quod sentit Ecclesia.* And we know, what follows——*Credendum, quod sentit*, Where the contraries are immediate, *& sublato uno, ponitur alterum.* But this latter also is expresly said by him ‖---- *Si quid horum per orbem frequentat Ecclesia; hoc, quin ita faciendum sit, disputare, insolentissimæ insaniæ est.* This, concerning doing; and then it holds also for believing; the Church's Faith being (if either) more sure, than her practise. But, for believing too, he saith ‖ ---- *Restat, ut hoc credamus, quod universa Ecclesia, a Sacrilegio schismatis remota, custodit.* ---- And ---- *Quod in hac re* sentiendum *est, plenioris Concilii sententiâ totius Ecclesiæ consensio confirmat.*]

‖ Epist. 118.

‖ De Bapt. l. 1. c. 18.

Therefore, after the Churches definition, he saith, One, in holding the contrary, then first becomes an Heretick, when he knows, or by his fault is ignorant, that the Church hath defined it; See *de Baptism. contra Donat. l.* 4. c. 16. ---- *Constituamus ergo* (saith he) *duos aliquos isto modo, unum eorum, verbi gratiâ id sentire de Christo, quod Photinus opinatus est* [i. e. in modern language, to be a Socinian, no small errour] *& in ejus hæresi baptizari extra Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Communionem; alium vero hoc idem sentire, sed in Catholicâ baptizari, existimantem ipsam esse Catholicam fidem; Illum nondum Hæreticum dico, nisi manifestatâ sibi doctrinâ Catholicæ fidei, resistere maluerit, & illud, quod tenebat, elegerit,* &c.

§. 19.

And this is Dr. *Hammonds* Comment on the forequoted place of *Titus* (how consonant to, his own, or other Protestants doctrines, I know not)---- Αὐτοκατάκριτος ‖ *self-condemned, signifies not a man's publick accusing, or condemning his own doctrines or practices; for that self-condemnation, being an effect, and part of repentance, would rather be a motive to free any from the censures of the Church, who were already under them, then aggravate their crime, or bring that punishment upon them;* Nor yet 2ly. *can it denote him that offends, and yet still continues to offend against conscience; and, though he be in the wrong, yet holds out in opposition to the Church. For (besides, that there are very few that do so, and these known to none but God; and, if that were the Character of an Heretick, then none but Hypocrites would be Hereticks; and he, that, through pride, and opinion of his own judgement, stood out against the doctrine of Christ, and his Church in the purest times, should not be an Heretick) this inconvenience would further be incurred, that no Heretick could possibly be admonished, or censured by the Church; for no man would acknowledge of himself, that what he did was by him done a-*

‖ P. 761.

gainst

gainst his own conscience; nor could any testimony be produced against him before any humane Tribunal; no man being able to search the heart. It is rather an expression of his separation from, and disobedience to, the Church; and so an evidence of the ἐξέστραπται καὶ ἁμαρτάνει *being perverted, and sinning wilfully, and without excuse. For he that thus disobeys, and breaks off from the unity of the Church, doth in effect inflict that punishment on himself, which the Church useth to Malefactors, that is,* καθαίρεσις 2 Cor. 13. 10 *and* ἐξαιρέω, *cutting off from the Church; which when he being an Heretick (and therein a Schismatick also) doth voluntarily, without the Judges sentence, his very* αἵρεσις *is a spontaneous* καθαίρεσις, *or excision.*

And, that this Doctor may not go alone, see Dr. *Ferne's* Comment on the same place ‖ when he writ against Presbyterians, accusing them of Schism from the Church of *England* ---- *The word* Heretick (saith he), *according to the use of it, then, implied one, that obstinately stood out against the Church, or that led any Sect* — *After the strictest Sect (or Heresie) of the Pharisees,* (Acts 26. 5.) — *After that, which they call Heresie,* Acts 24. 14. *a factious Company divided from the Church, so they called, or accounted of Christians,* — *and* (Gal. 5. 20.) *we have it reckoned among the works of the flesh;* Debates, Contentions, Heresie; *So here,* Heretick, *that leads a faction, a sect, or that wilfully follows, or abets it. A man therefore, that is a Heretick, contentious, disobedient to the Order and authority of the* Church, *rejected, for he is self condemned; having both past the sentence upon himself, by* professing against, *or dividing from,* the Church: *and also done execution, (like that of the Church's censure, and excommunication) upon himself by actual separation, or going out of the Church. A fearful condition.* Thus he. And something to the same purpose saith Dr. *Hammond,* ‖ concerning the guilt of those, who afterward deny, or oppose, the things defined, and added to the Apostles Creed, by the *first* Councils. ---*Though the Creed* (saith he) *in the ancient Apostolick form, were sufficient for any man to believe and profess; yet, when the Church hath thought meet to erect that* additional Bulwark *against* Hereticks; *the rejecting, or denying the truth of those their* additions, *may justly be deemed an interpretative siding with those ancient, or a desire to introduce some new, Heresies.* ---- *And the pride, or singularity, or heretical design of opposing or questioning them, now they are framed, being irreconcileable with Christian charity, and humility, is justly deemed criminous, and liable to censures.* ---- *Again, §. 6. Though those, who believed,* &c. [the matter of the Apostles Creed], *had all those Branches of Christian Faith which were required to qualifie mankind to submit to Christs Reformation, yet* (he grants)

‖ The Case between the Ch. of *Engl.* and *Rome.* p. 53.

‖ Of Fundamentals, c. 9. § 4.

the wilful opposing *these more explicit Articles* [added by Councils] *and the* resisting *of them, when they are competently* proposed *from the* Definition *of the* Church, *will bring danger of ruine on such persons.*----Again §. 8.---- *This* [(*i*) of one Baptism] *and all the former additions* [in the Nicene Creed] *being thus setled by the universal Church were, and still are in all reason, without disputing, to be received, and embraced by the present Church, and every meek member thereof.*----[Here then it seems that *Heresie* it is, or something *criminous*, equivalent thereto, to oppose the Church's *definitions*, and additions, though the former Creed was sufficient to have been believed, and professed in all times before them.] Lastly, King *James*, in his Answer to Card. *Perron* penned by *Casaubon*, seems to have the same Notion of Heresie, as also of Schism, with the *Roman* Church, and the Fathers; making *Heresie* any departing from the *Faith*, *Schism*, from the *Communion*, of the *Church Catholick*---- *Credit vero Rex* (saith *Casaubon* ‖) *simpliciter sine fuco & fallaciis, unicam esse Ecclesiam Dei, & re, & nomine, Catholicam, sive Universalem toto diffusam mundo: extra quam ipse quoque nullam Salutem debere sperari affirmat: damnat & detestatur eos, qui vel jam olim, vel postea, aut a fide recesserunt Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, & facti sunt Hæretici; aut à Communione, & facti sunt Schismatici.* [Difference here about the Extent of the Catholick Church there is some; but none; that all opposition of its Faith is Heresie.] Again ---- *Nullam spem Salutis superesse iis, qui à fide Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, aut ab ejusdem Communione discesserint, Rex ultro concedit.* [I suppose, here is meant the *present* Catholick Church, and, in any difference, the *main Body* thereof: its *whole and integral* Faith, or *any part* thereof: and, its, *external* Communion. Otherwise if this meant of the Catholick Church collectively *of all ages*; when, in some ages, several points of Faith were not yet defined: and of *every member* thereof in those ages; when, in most points, may be found some dissenters: and of Points of Faith *necessary* (inferiors being Judges), a term applyed, as any one pleaseth, to more points or fewer: Lastly of Communion *internal*; which may be said now to be deserted, now retained, as any diversly fancieth the true causes thereof; then, in all this said, nothing at all is said.]

‖ Letter to *Perron.*

§. 20.

12. [2] Again; for *Schism*; *Catholicks* affirm ---- *That any particular, Person, or Church, which (for what cause soever, and particularly for this, the Church's requiring his assent, and conformity to the Definitions of such her Councils) doth actually relinquish, and separate from the external Communion of the present Church-Catholick*

lick is Schismatical. [Meaning here, * *by Catholick Church*, the present true Superior Ecclesiastical Guides, and the Christian Congregations joyned with them, in the sence explained before. *Disc.* 2. *Prop.* 12. §. 23. And * by *External Communion*, the Church's Publick Prayers, and Worship of God, and the participation of her Sacraments. And * by *actual relinquishing*, and *separating*, either [1] the setting up or joyning with, an Anti-communion; or [2] a Voluntary absenting ones self from the Church's Communion; or at least [3] the incurring of an Excommunication, or Separation, inflicted by the Church, for a non-conformity to her Decrees (of which see Dr. *Hammond's* Concession below §. 22. n. 2.)]

§. 21.

The Reason; Because [1] all *separation* from the external Communion of this Church, that is made out of a Non-conformity to any thing defined by these Superiors, is judged *causeless*, upon the former account, given §. 6. and §. 14. Since they can require no *unjust* condition of their Communion, (as, the assent, or subscription to an Error) that any Inferior can justly judge, or certainly know, to be so. And this; because in Necessaries these Church-Governors cannot misse-guide (§. 6, 9.) And of what, or how much is to be accounted necessary, the judgement also belongs to these Guides, not their Subjects (see *Disc.* 2. *Prop.* 6.) Of whom also (divinely assisted) it is rationally presumed, that, to things judged no way necessary, they will never enjoyn Assent upon the Church's Censures. But lastly; supposing, (not granting) that they should err in some non-necessary, to which notwithstanding they require Assent; yet cannot particular men have, in such matters, any sufficient ground of an infallible assurance of the contrary, (which the Church cannot discover ‖); and therefore cannot justly, on any such account, withdraw their submission. And for this reason also these Superiors, in whatever decrees they make, or impose, do never fall actually, or causally, into Heresie, or Schisme; as who are not, from others, but all others, from them, directed to learn, in spiritual matters, what is true, and lawful; and to what they are, or are not, to conform. But, [2] Next, If any *separation* from this *Church*, should be made for any Doctrine, or Practice in it, to which an assent, or a conformity is no way required by it; This will still be an *higher Schisme*, because more void of any just Pretence.

‖ See *Disc.* 2. §. 15. & 42.

Of this matter thus S. *Austin* ‖ (speaking not of the internal, but the external Communion of the Catholick Church, which, defining against Rebaptization, was upon this, forsaken by the

‖ Epist. 48.

Donatists

Donatistis)---- *Fieri non potest ut aliquis habeat justam causam, quâ communionem suam separaret à communione orbis terrarum*, &c.

And (*de unitate Ecclesiæ*, c. 3.) ---- *Quicunque à Christi corpore, quod est Ecclesia, ita dissentiunt, ut eorum Communio non sit cum toto, quacunque diffunditur, sed in aliquâ parte separatâ intercipiatur, manifestum est eos non esse in Catholicâ Ecclesia.* [*Cum toto, i. e.* * with the Communion of that Body, which was *totum integrum*, before some separated from it; or after the separation, when now the former *totum* is divided, * with that part of the *totum*, from which the other part separates; which Body, that is parted from, is still the total Catholick Church, (of which total only S. *Austin* speaks); though the divided part, or parts (for the amplitude of this *totum*, is a casual thing, nor always the same) should in time swell to a greater magnitude, than it.]

Concerning this matter also, thus Dr. *Hammond* ‖ in his Book of Schisme, c. 1. ---- *For the universal, or truly Catholick Church of Christ; it is not, in St.* Austin's *Opinion, possible, that there should be any just cause for any to separate from it, nor consequently Apology to be made for those, that, on any, whether true, or pretended cause whatsoever, have really incurred this guilt; and that it is not the Examination of the Occasion, or Cause, or Motive of any man's Schisme, that is worth the producing, or heeding in this matter, The one thing that is of force, and moment, and by consequence pertinent to be enquired into, is the truth of the matter of fact; whether this charge be sufficiently proved, or confessed*; i. e. *whether he that is thus accused, stands really guilty of Separation from the Church of Christ?* Thus Dr. *Hammond*. Where it would be ridiculous for any to say; that, by separation from the Church-Catholick, he means voluntary separation; and then, that by voluntary separation, he means a separation without any just cause, moving him to it; for this is only saying; there can never be just cause of a voluntary separation from the Church-Catholick without any just cause. Neither can the Doctor's meaning here be; that one indeed may not separate, but yet may by Excommunication be separated, for his non-conforming, in something, to the Church-Catholick, without Schism. For, elsewhere ‖, he declareth——*Continuance in* [I add, or incurring] *Excommunication to be actual Schism, supposing, that, if one will submit to that, which is lawful* [not that which he thinks lawful] *for him to submit to, he may be absolved, and freed from it.* Now the Church-Catholick, he holds here, can never require unjust conditions of her Communion, because upon such terms (he alloweth) a departure may be, without Schism. Here then, taking his words in their

‖ of Schism. p. 10.

‖ *Answ.* to Cath. Gentlm. p. 9.

their plain sence, since the Church Catholick cannot be denyed to be such a Church, as gives Laws, and requires certain Conditions of her external Communion; and since the Doctor affirms, ‖ that, where a Church requires unjust Conditions of her Communion, one may depart from, or continue out of, it, without Schism, it seems to follow, that the Doctor holds here; that the Church-Catholick can never require such unjust conditions (which how it consists with what is quoted out of him. *Disc* 1. §.5. I know not); and hence, that she did not require such at *Luther's* appearance. [Yet it is clear, that there was no Church then extant, (one, or more of which must be the Catholick), to the conditions of whose external Communion Protestants would submit; and from whose external Communion they departed not, See *Disc.* 1. §.55. n.4. And then we see what followers, upon these Principles of Dr. *Hammond's*.]

‖ Of Schisme c 2.n.3.5,12.

§.23.

Mean while the *Catholicks* grant, 1ly. *That, the several parts of this body may, without Schism, separate, or differ from one another in any doctrine, or practice, wherein they are obliged to no agreement or union from the Common Superiors of them both; and so long, as one part divides not from the other in any thing, wherein the other agrees with the whole against it; or, which the whole enjoyns both to the other, and it. But in such case, the division of this part is, as from the* other *part, so from the* whole; *and so becomes, for its division from the* whole (*and not from the other* part), *Schismatical.* 2ly. They grant also; *that one part may, lawfully, and without Schism, separate, or rather, absent it self from the external Communion of another, so often as either the Communion of the other part, suspected of Heresie or Schism, (before any evidence of the contrary.) is thought unlawful; or as this part requires some condition of its external Communion, to which the other is not, by the whole, or by the Superiors of both, any way obliged.*

Thus the *Catholicks*.

CHAP. IV.

On the other side, the Protestants, after the four first Propositions conceded, thus proceeding to qualifie them. 5. *In their granting the Catholick Church unerrable in Necessaries, understanding thereby only such few Points, without which Salvation no way attainable.* §. 24. 6. *Affirming the Church Catholick*

Catholick, or all particular Churches of some one age, or ages, errable in several other doctrines, dangerous to Salvation, gross, damnable, &c. §. 25. *Because it appears, that many of the chief Points, from which Protestants dissent, were the General Tenents and Practices, at the coming of* Luther, §. 26.

7. 8. *Affirming,* * *the Church's General Councils also, when universally accepted, to be unerring in Necessaries; but not so, in other (and that is in the most) Points. And, in the former,* [1] *Extending* universal acceptation *to all particular Churches; and* [2] *Restraining* Necessaries *(as before) to those absolutely so. Again:* * *The Councils not so accepted, to be errable also in Necessaries.* §. 34. 35, 36. 9. 10. *Allowing Obedience also due to the Definitions and Decrees of such Councils: But not, that of Assent; but only of Non-contradiction.* §. 39. *(Where, of the Quality of the Obedience yeilded by the Church of* England *to the four first* Councils) §. 40. 11. *Of* Non contradiction: *not generally; but where the Error of the Council not* manifest, *and* intolerable. §. 43. *Claiming also, where the Errour manifest, a power, against such Council, to reform it, for themselves.* §. 44.

12. *The judgement also (as for themselves,) when there is, or is not, such Error in Councils, left to particular Persons, or Churches,* §. 47.

§. 24. BUt the *Protestants*, after conceding the four first Propositions, labour to pull down these superstructures of the Catholicks, which they see, else, would ruine their cause; and thus proceed.

After the first four Propositions above, agreed on,

5ly. They explain themselves, *That, by the* Necessaries, *wherein* (Prop. 2.) *they grant the Catholick Church of all ages unerrable, they understand only those* few *Points* (spoken of before Disc. 2. Prop. 6.) *without the explicit Belief of which Salvation is not at all attainable.*

For, in their saying, that she is so unerrable, they thus declare themselves. *That there alwayes shall be a number of men professing Christianity in the world*; So Mr. *Stillingfleet.* ‖--- *A company of men that profess* at least so much *Truth as is* absolutely *necessary for their Salvation*; So Mr. *Chillingworth.* ‖--- *That Christ doth, and will so defend his Church, that there shall be* forever *till the end of the world, a* Church Christian *on the earth*; So Dr. *Hammond* ‖ No more inerrability in Faith, you see, here affirmed, than that, without which Salvation is absolutely, on what terms soever,

‖ Stillingf. p. 251.

‖ P. 15.

‖ Defence of Lord *Falkland*, c. 1. §. 5. 6. p. 23.

soever, in the Profession of Christianity, not attainable; wherein, they straiten Christs promises, as the Catholicks enlarge them; by which they gain the liberty of *reforming*, as they think fit, from the *universal* Church of God, as to some age, or ages, in most of her Doctrines; as they granting her not, save in some few necessaries, unerrable, that may, as it were, still preserve life in Her; neither will they, concerning this Question, what are points necessary, (wherein our Lord hath promised an indefectibility to his Church,) what not, by any means stand to her judgement.

6ly. They say: || *That though the Church-Catholick is preserved always from errors in absolute necessaries, taken in their sence* (§.24) (*for, otherwise, there would cease to be a Church of Christ upon earth*); *yet the same Church, or at least any, or all particular Churches of some age, or ages* (*some one, or many, or all, which particular Churches must be the* visible universal *Church-Catholick of that age, or ages*) *may generally hold, and the Governors thereof impose upon their Subjects, such errors and corruptions, as are* dangerous to Salvation; gross, damnable, &c. *and therefore which, upon a general Reformation neglected, are corrigible, and reformable by any particular Church for it self* [See what Arch-bishop *Laud*, §.37. n.5.6.---- Mr. *Stillingfleet*, Part 2. c.2. p.330. ---- and c.4. p.370.371.---- and c.8. p.478 479.---- Mr. *Chillingworth*, c.5.§.64. 49,45,27.---- and the 31st. Article of the Church of *England*, have said to this purpose.] §. 25. §. 26.

And the Reason of this Assertion seems to be: because these great points of modern controversie. §. 27.

1. A *Corporal Presence* and a *Transubstantiation*, or substantial Conversion of the Elements into Christs Body. §. 28.

2. *Adoration* of the *Eucharist*; i.e. of Christs Body, and Blood, as present in it; which followes from the former. §. 29.

3. The *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*; not onely that of *Prayers*, *Praise*, and Thanksgivings; nor only of the Mysteries, in the consecrating of them, offered as a Commemorative of the Passion (a thing conceded also by learned Protestants): but also of the very Body and Blood of Christ in these Mysteries (which thing follows from the first Point) offered in this Service, *pro vivis, & Defunctis*, &c. §. 30.

4. *Invocation* of the *Blessed Virgin*, and *Saints*.

And 5. Such *Prayer* for the *dead*, as infers their *present* condition *before* the day of Judgement, (whatever their restraint, or sufferings be), to be conceived *betterable* by the Intercessions of the Living, ---- Do appear to have been, *universally*, held, and practised; and the approbation, and conformity to §. 31.

them impoſed by the Eccleſiaſtical Governors, both of the Greek and Latine Church, at the coming of *Luther*.

§. 32. The clearning of which, becauſe it is a conſideration of great importance, and not meet to be omitted; nor can be here inſerted without making too great a *Parentheſis*, and diſtracting your thoughts from the matter in hand; I have rather choſen to annex it at the end of this diſcourſe, Cap. 11. §. 158. referring you to that place, for the peruſal thereof, if not in this matter already ſatisfied.

§. 33. This then concerning the 6th. Propoſition: The Proteſtants affirming, that the Catholick Church of ſome age may iucurr, and maintain dangerous, groſs, damnable, errours; and the reaſon inducing them thereunto.

§. 34. 7ly. They ſay. 1ſt. *That, though the* Catholick Church *cannot err in abſolute neceſſaries*; *Yet the* Governors, *and* Paſtors *thereof* [Yet theſe are they who are appointed by Chriſt to inſtruct, and guide the reſt] *are not ſo included in our Saviours promiſe of the Churches Indefectibility, but that they,* (i.e. *the much major part of them*) *even when met in a General Council* (*if this not ſuch as is accepted by the Church diffuſive*) *may err in their Decrees; and that, even in Credends and Practicals that are* fundamental, *and* neceſſary *for obtaining Salvation; even thoſe neceſſary abſolutely* (for ſuch inerrability in abſolutely neceſſaries they allow onely to the Church diffuſive, not to her repreſentative.) 2yl. *That as the Church diffuſive, ſo her General Councils, though theſe by the Church diffuſive univerſally accepted, may err in* non-fundamentals, *or* non-neceſſaries; *which* non-neceſſaries, *in their ſence thereof* ‖ *do extend to all points whatſoever, except thoſe few, without belief of which, both the being of a Chriſtian Church, and the attaining of ſalvation, abſolutely faileth.*

‖ See before, §. 24.—and below, §. 52.

§. 35. 8ly. Hence they ſay: *That ſo many of former Councils, as are acknowledged to be lawfully general, by the general conſent of the Chriſtian World; or, whoſe decrees, when publiſhed, are univerſally,* i.e. by the whole Church Catholick, *accepted, they will allow, for truly Oecumenical* [*or equivalent thereto*], So Mr. *Stillingfleet* †: *or* [as the Arch-biſhop further ‖] *for infallible alſo*; i.e. as to neceſſaries; becauſe the diffuſive Catholick Church is held always in neceſſaries infallible] †; and, *That they will make this conſent of the whole Chriſtian World their judge, in this caſe* ‖.

† P. 536. ‖ P. 346.] † Ap. *Laud*, p. 139 & 318 --See §. 2. ‖ *Still.* p. 536. -- Ap. *Laud*, 195.]

§. 36. But then; here are two limitations (*One*, of *allowing theſe* Coun-

Councils infallible, or unerring, *in necessaries onely*; the *other: if such Councils be universally accepted,*) which (as they understand them) seem to discharge them of all obligation of assent to the decrees of any, though reputed never so lawful, or general a Council; I mean as to any grounding such assent upon its absolutely not erring by vertue of our Lords Promise.

1. For, from the first limitations of the *Council's not erring only in Necessaries*: 1st. they hold no assent, or submission of judgment, necessarily or absolutely due to a Council in such things wherein it is errable, as it is in all Non-necessaries. 2. Next they say, that these Councils that are unerring in Necessaries, may not prescribe to them, what points are necessary, what not? (for so a Council might oblige their assent so far as it pleaseth) and from whom else they should learn Necessaries, I see not. And till they can distinguish these, they have no means to know, whether such Council is unerring in those particulars which it defines, as being Necessaries. But, according to their *restraint* also of *Necessaries*, most conciliary definitions must be in Non-necessaries; wherein therefore these Councils are fallible; *fallible*, though *universally accepted*. But if such Council not universally accepted, then fallible, they say, it may be also in Fundamentals.

§. 37.

2ly. For the second limitation, requiring the universal acceptation of such general Councils, or the consent of the Church diffusive to their Decrees; many of the reformed seem to exact this consent so far extended to all particular persons, or Churches, as that scarce any of those Councils general, even which they do allow, have had one so entire. For the reason, why a general Council universally accepted erreth not in Fundamentals, being this, Because the *whole* Church, or its *Clergy* diffusive, that accepts it, can never so err; and they maintaining, that in the Church diffusive, not the *much major* part of it, or of its Clergy, (I mean of those whose judgment can be procured) but only *some part or other* thereof, shall never so err, (which part how small, or inconsiderable, mean while it may be in number, or dignity, to the rest, they know not;) hence, any consent, or acceptation of the Church, or Clergy, less than *all*, or what is near it, renders them not secure of its not erring: Because here the promise of not erring may possibly be verified only in the small dissenting party. See Doctor *Hamond* of Heresie, *p.* 156. *n.* 6. where he saith, *That the promise of the Gates of Hell not prevailing against the Church, can no way belong to a Council unless all the Members of the Church were met together in that*

Council; for if there be any left out, why (saith he) *may not the promise be good in them, though the Gates of Hell should be affirmed to prevail against the Council.?* ‖ And what he saith of the Council, holds as much in the acceptation of it, where some refuse this. So therefore, none can give faith to the definition (concerning *Christs Godhead*) of the Fathers in the Council of *Nice*, upon our Lords promise of the Gates of Hell not prevailing against his Church; if some few oppose it, (as the *Arians* did) for in them, not those of the Council, may the Promise be made good. And hence, whilst they find in former ages a *Berengarius*, a *Wicliffe*, the *Waldenses*, an *Hus*, a *Luther*, and some Followers, varying from the judgment of the Councils called in their times, they are willing to believe the Orthodox and *Catholick Faith*, to have been preserved in *these* few Dissenters, and the Councils, though universally accepted by the rest, to have erred from it; nor to oblige them upon the account of so general an approbation: and thus, even the dissent of those persons, who have no power to vote in the Council, yet out of it, is effectual to void the obligation of the Council. So, though they usually name the *Greek* and *Gallican*, as well as Protestant Churches, as non-acceptors of the Council of *Trent*; yet, if a sufficient acceptation thereof, as to *Protestant Controversies* both of the *Gallican* and *Greek* Churches be proved to them, nothing is gained hence for securing its merrability even in a Fundamental; because the belief of all necessaries, and the verifying of the Divine Promises, they hold may be sufficiently conserved in the *Protestants solely* standing out against it. And, when they grant, that Councils *universally accepted* cannot err in necessaries; they say only this, That *some or other* professing Christianity shall never so err; and then conclude from hence, that neither doth or can the *whole so* err in those things, wherein it agrees with them. But next; admitting an infallibility in Necessaries to be allowed by the more sober and judicious Protestants to a Council accepted by a *much major part* of the Church-Catholick; though some persons, or Churches also, dissent, (without which nothing even in the first General Councils stands firm;) yet herein still is continued a contest, when the number of Dissenters is so great, and considerable, as to invalidate the ratification of the rest, when not: Nor see I, how it can be reasonably desided (yet a thing of greatest consequence) unless herein the minor will be content to follow the judgment of the much major part concerning what Councils stand thus admitted, or rejected; which rule were it observed, then both, in a valid acceptance of the Councils held in the Western Church in latter ages, Protestants will

‖ See *Chilling.* c. 2. p. 139.— *Stillingf.* pag. 251.

will be cast; and, by the determinations of those Councils, several of their Disputes ended.

Mean while, upon these and other pretences so it is; that of 16. Councils, or thereabouts (reckoned up by the Cardinal ‖) whose Decrees all the Western Churches (wherein several of these Councils, the most General that those times could afford, were called, for ending of some Controversies, that both arose in, and troubled, only the West) of 16. Councils I say, which the Western Parts generally accepted, when *Luther* appeared; and which all the rest of the Western Churches, except these Reformers, continue still to approve, they allow none of them, that have handled matters of Controversie, wherein the present times are concerned, after the four first, or the 5th. and 6th. but then cutting off here the Canons made in *Trullo*, even those, wherein both East and West consented: and so, do allow none of any note that have been held in the Church for near this 1000 years; there being none of the *more famous* of them, and the acts whereof are *extant*, wherein something hath not been passed, that is contrary to the present Protestant Tenents ‖.

‖ De Concil. l.1. c 5.

‖ See 1 Disc §. 50. n.2.

§. 38.

9ly. *To the Decrees of these General Council. also, when universally acknowledged such*, (*which yet, when so, they say, may err in non necessaries*), they grant indeed *an obedience due by all Inferiors, Persons, or Churches.* And consequently, to those Decrees, in which they hold such Councils unerrable, *i. e.* in necessaries, if all these necessaries were certainly distinguishable from all other points that are not so, they must allow due an obedience of *assent*.

§. 39.

But, 10ly. *They allow not* (*absolutely*) *This obedience of assent to their decrees* ‖; *but onely, where inferiors see just cause of dissenting* (*as sometimes they say they may. since all these Councils are liable to error in non-fundamentals, which also, it is not known, how far they do extend*) *that of* silence, *and* non-publick contradiction.

‖ Stillingf. pl. 506.

§. 40.

The Church of *England* indeed professeth her *Assent* to the Definitions of the *first four General Councils*; and Mr. *Stillingfleet*, (I know not on what Protestant ground) saith, ‖ *It is her duty to keep their Decrees, and be guided by the sence of Scripture, as interpreted by them.* But you may observe: that this assent is not yeilded to those Councils, because lawfully general; and so presumed to be assisted by our Lord in the right defining and delivery of all *necessary* Faith (for they say, lawful General Councils,

‖ P.375.

not

not universally accepted in their sence, may err in Fundamentals: and those Councils, that are universally accepted, may err in Non-fundamentals); but because the matter defined by them (the Church of *England* being, for Her self, judge hereof) ought to be assented to, as being agreeable to the Scriptures; and the Assent * is not yeilded for the Authority defining, as infallibly assisted in necessaries, but for the seeming evidence of the thing defined; or (at least) for the non-appearing evidence of the contrary; * is not yeilded, because that particular persons, or Churches, are to *take* that for the *true* sence of Scripture, which these *Councils* may, possibly, *give* of it; but because those *Councils* gave, in their Definitions, that sence of Scripture, which such particular *Persons*, or Churches *judge* the *true*; so that the reason, which they give for their Assent to these General Councils, obligeth as much their Assent to them, had they been Provincial; And upon the same terms, as one person, or Church, assents to these Councils, because they judge their Decrees consonant to Gods Word, another, without withdrawing any due obedience, may dissent, who judgeth the contrary; and the authority, or decision, laies on Christians no ground of obligation, as to belief, save the reasonableness, or non-appearing unreasonableness of the Councils Doctrines: and submission of judgement is held not lawfully yeilded by any, to whom the contrary seems *evident*: and by all others, is to be only conditional, *viz.* until the contrary shall appear *evident*.

§. 41. n. 1. [c] To this purpose, see the 21 *Article* of the Church of [c] *England* ---- *General Councils may err; wherefore things ordained* [c] *by them, as necessary to Salvation, have neither strength, nor autho-* [c] *rity, unless it may be declared, that they were taken out of holy Scri-* [c] *pture.* See the Act of Parliament, 1 *Elizabethæ*, c. 1. [c] wherein the determing, or adjudging any thing *Heresie*, by any [c] Council, is thus limited; If, in such Council, the same is de- [c] clared *Heresie* by the *express*, and plain words of the Canonical [c] *Scriptures.* The words are ---- *Provided, that such persons*, &c. [c] *shall not have authority to determine any matters to be Heresie, but* [c] *only such, as heretofore have been determined, ordered, or adjudged to* [c] *be Heresie by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the first* [c] *four General Councils, or any of them; or by any other General* [c] *Councils, wherein the same was declared Heresie by the* Express, *and* [c] plain words *of the said Canonical* Scriptures. And see (in [c] Soave. p. 344. 366.) the exceptions taken by Protestants at [c] the safe-conduct of the Council of *Trent*, for not adding to the autho-

'authority of Councils and Fathers [*fundantes se veraciter in Scri-*
'*ptura*], as it run formerly in the safe-conduct of *Basil*; *That the*
'*Councils, Fathers*, &c. *conformable to the Scripture, should be*
'*Judges*; by which means the Protestants reserved this re-
'treat, when *Councils* appeared against them, that yet they were
'not obliged by them, because these *Councils* went also against the
'*Scriptures.* See Dr. *Fern*, Consid. p. 19.--- *To all the deter-*
'*minations of the Church we owe submission by Assent, and belief condi-*
'*tional, with reservation for evidence out of Gods Word*--- *and*--*In*
'*matters of Faith* (*saith he*) *we cannot submit to any company of men,*
'*by resignation of our judgement, and belief, or standing bound to re-*
'*ceive for faith, and worship, all that they shall define, and impose for*
'*such*; *for such resignation gives to man, what is due to God.* See
'Arch-bishop *Laud*, p. 245.--- *General Councils lawfully called*, &c.
'*cannot err*, keeping themselves to Gods Rule——And p. 239.--*In*
'*all truth* necessary *to Salvation* (*saith he*) *I shall easily grant a Ge-*
'*neral Council cannot err* [*if*] suffering it self to be led by the Spirit
'of Truth in the Scripture; *and not taking upon it to lead both the*
'*Scripture, and the Spirit* See Dr. *Field*, p. 666.--- *It is not*
'*necessary for us, expresly to believe whatsoever the Council hath con-*
'*cluded, though it be true*: *unless by some other means it appear unto us*
'*to be true, and we be convinced of it in some other sort, than by the bare*
'*determination of the Council only.* But *it sufficeth, that we be ready ex-*
'*presly to believe it, if it shall be made to appear unto us.* See Dr.
'Hammond, *of Heresie* p. 96. 'It *is hence manifest also what is the*
'*ground of that reverence, that is by all sober Christians deemed due*
'*and paid, to the first four General Councils*: *Because*, 1st., *They set*
'*down and convinced the Truth of their Doctrine out of the Scripture.*
'2ly. *Because they were so near the Apostles times, when the sence*
'*of the Apostles might more easily be fetched from those Men and*
'*Churches, to whom they had committed it.* [Thus he; though, be-
'sides that the first of these Councils was almost at 300. years di-
'stance; the reason of obedience to Church Governors, given by
'Doctor *Hammond* elsewhere ‖ (*viz.* 'Because Christ speaks to ‖ Of Funda-
'us in those Governors *as his immediate successors in the Prophetick*, mentals p. 503.
'*Pastoral, Episcopal office*) *infers, that the Churches authority in all*
'*ages is equally valid, and so voids this reason.* He goes on.] 3*dly.* Be-
'*cause the great Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity were the mat-*
'*ter of their definitions*, [yet he saith (*see Disc.* 1. §. 6.) *that Gene-*
'*ral Councils are no infallible Guide in Fundamentals, and* ‖—*that it is* ‖ Of Heresy
'*the matter of the Decrees and the Apostolicalness of them, and the* P. 115.
'*force of the testification, whereby they are approved, and acknowledged*
'*to be such, which gives the authority to the Council, and*

'*nothing*

'nothing else is sufficient, where that is not to be found.]

§. 41. n. 2. 'See Mr. Chillingw. p. 118. Dr. Potter, together with the Article 'of the Church of England attributeth to the Church, nay to particular 'Churches (and I subscribe to his opinion) an authority of determining 'Controversies of faith according to plain and evident Scripture, and 'universal Tradition; and infallibility, whilst they proceed according to 'this Rule. And p. 200.--- The Fathers of the Church (saith he) 'in after-times [i.e. after the Apostles] might have just cause to declare 'their judgment touching the sence of some General Article of the 'Creed; but to oblige others to receive their Declarations under pain 'of damnation; what warrant they had I know not: He that can shew, 'either that the Church of all Ages was to have this authority, or that 'it continued in the Church for some Ages, and then expired: He that 'can shew either of these things, let him; for my part I cannot: Yet 'I willingly confess the judgement of a Council, though not infallible, is 'yet so far directive and obliging, that (without apparent reason to the 'contrary) it may be sin to reject it, at least not to afford it an outward 'submission, for publick peace sake. See Mr. Whitby, p. 92.--- We 'do appeal to the four first General Councils, not because we believe them 'infallible, but because we conceive them to agree with Scripture which 'is infallible; so that we make them secondary, not primary Guides; 'we resolve not our belief of their decrees into their authority, but 'into their agreement with Scripture; we do not say, we must believe 'this, or that, because any one of the first four General Councils hath 'defined it; but, because what the Council hath defined is evident in 'Scripture, therefore do we believe it: And if we should finde, that in 'any Article they dissented from Scripture, we should in that as much 'oppose them, as we do you--- and p. 451.--- I answer with Dr Taylor, 'that either these Councils are tyed to the Rule of Gods Word, or not, 'if the first, then are they to be examined by it; and to be followed no 'further than they adhere to this unerring rule [examined: He means 'by those persons, whom, yet, these Councils are to teach the sence of 'Scripture]--- and p. 15.--- We generally acknowledge that no autho-'rity on earth obligeth to internal Assent. [This the firm ground '(i. e. his own judgement, what Conciliary Decrees agree, or disa-'gree with Scripture) that this young man builds on, for the 'confuting of Mr. Cressies book] See Mr. Stillingfleet, p. 58. '59, 133, 154, 252. and 375. 517. compared. There he saith on one 'side (p. 375.--- That the Church of England looks on it as her duty to 'keep to the Decrees of the four General Councils,--- And--- We pro-'fess (saith he) to be guided by the sence of Scripture, as interpreted 'by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the four first General 'Councils--- And p. 56. he saith, That the Church of England ad-

mits

'mits not any thing to be delivered as the ſence of Scripture, which is 'contrary to the conſent of the Catholick Church in the four firſt ages. '[Here he ſeems to acknowledge a ſubmiſſion of Proteſtants to the 'conſent of the Catholick Church in the four firſt ages, and to 'the four firſt General Councils, as their *Guide*, for what is the 'ſence of *Scripture*: which ſeems to me no way to conſiſt with a 'profeſſion of ſubmitting to the ſame Church or her Councils, on-'ly when, or as far as, they agree (in their Decrees), with the *ſence* 'of *Scripture*: which laſt implies, that I learn the ſence of Scri-'pture not from *them*, but *another*; and aſſent to them, where 'they conform to that judgement, of which I learn it]--- *Ibid*, He 'hath theſe two Propoſitions:--- 1 *That it is a ſufficient preſcription* 'against any thing, that can be alledged out of Scripture, that it ought 'not to be looked on as the true meaning of the Scripture, if it appears 'contrary to the ſence of the Catholick Church from the beginning.--- 'And this,--- 2 *That ſuch Doctrines may well be judged deſtructive to* 'the Rule of Faith, which were ſo unanimouſly condemned by the Catho-'lick Church within that time. [Where he allows not Chriſtians to 'try, and ſo aſſent to, or diſſent from, the Decrees of Councils, by 'what appears to them the ſence of Scripture; but refers them 'to learn the ſence of Scripture from the Decrees of theſe firſt 'Councils]. But yet on the other ſide he contends (how 'conſiſtently, I leave to the Readers judgement)--- *That the ſence of* 'the Catholick Church is not pretended to be any infallible Rule of in-'terpreting Scripture in all things, which concern the Rule of Faith--- 'And p. 17. concerning the neceſſity of believing the Articles of the 'Athanaſian Creed, he ſaith,--- *It is very unreaſonable to imagine that* 'the Church of England *doth own that neceſſity purely on the account* 'of the Church's Definition of thoſe things [therein], which are not 'Fundamental: it being Directly contrary to her ſence in her 19th. 'and 20th. Articles. And that hence the ſuppoſed neceſſity of the 'belief of the Articles of this Creed muſt, acccording to the ſence of the 'Church of England, be reſolved, either into the neceſſity of the mat-'ters, or into that neceſſity, which ſuppoſeth clear convictions, that the 'things therein contained are of Divine Revelation. And p. 133. '--- He deſcribes the Catholick Church, a ſociety of ſuch perſons, who 'all firmly believe that Doctrine infallible, which Chriſt delivered; but 'yet judge themſelves all fallible, and dare not uſurp that royal prero-'gative of Heaven, in preſcribing infallibly in matters queſtioned; 'but leave all [men] to judge according to the Pandects of the divine 'Laws, becauſe each member of this Society is bound to take care of 'his ſoul, and of all things, that tend thereto. Thus he. And 'generally Proteſtants hold; that the Church-Catholick diffuſive,

'of all ages; and therefore the Catholick Church, of the four 'first; and therefore also the General Councils of the four first 'ages, though universally accepted, may err in *non necessaries*; 'which is as much as to say; may give a wrong sence of Scripture, 'in them: notwithstanding that the Church of *England* obligeth 'Her self to the sence of this ancient Church; and this also, whilst 'she doth not know the *necessaries* from the other points, that are 'not so; and so neither knoweth, in what this ancient Church is 'not liable to errour.

§. 42. 'From these *Quotations*, I think, it appears; that, whatever 'fair professions are made, yet no *Assent* is given by them to the '*first four Councils* on this account, that they could not *err* in their 'Definitions: Nor yet, because they are their *Soveraign* Judge, 'from whose sentence they may not dissent, if they be perswaded, 'that it is *repugnant* to the *Scriptures*. And yet, of this *repugnancy* 'how they should come to any certain knowledge, I see no means. '*Certain* I grant they may be; that the Scriptures are the Word of 'God; and again, certain of that, which the Scripture delivers, 'where the sence thereof is by all pronounced clear, and not ambi- 'guous. But then: In a matter, where Scripture by several, and 'these in great numbers, and on both sides learned, is taken in a 'several sence; and the true sence thereof, is the thing in questi- ‖ P. 58. 'on; (as it is granted by Mr. *Stillingfleet* ‖ to have been, even in 'some of the greatest Articles of the Christian Faith): and yet ‖ See *Stillingf.* P. 59. 'further ‖, where, it seems, the Scripture may be so doubtful, that, 'the sence of the Catholick Church, or its lawful General Coun- 'cils (they say ‖) can be to them no certain, or infallible, Inter- ‖ Ib. 'preter of it: and lastly, where the judgement, or common Rea- 'son of a *lawful General Council* thinks it self so certain of the 'contrary, as to anathematize dissenters; On what grounds, '(here) any particular, Person, or Church, can assure themselves 'of their own sence of Scripture to be the true; they having left 'that of the Church's Councils, and of a major part of Christi- 'anity, who also judge their sence false, I understand not. Surely, 'they will not say, they have this certainty from the *Scripture*; be- 'cause the true sence thereof is the thing so mainly questioned; & 'the certainty, or infallibility of the *traditive sence* of the Church 'they renounce; and then (which only is left) *their own judge- 'ment*, or their *own*, (which I see not how they rightly call) *com- 'mon Reason*, when that of a General Council, or major part of 'Christianity, differs from it, one would think, should be a more 'fallible ground to them, than the judgement, or *common Reason* 'of the Church.]

This,

This, of the Obedience of Assent denied, and that of silence, or non-contradiction only allowed, by them, to the Definitions of Councils.

But 11ly. *This obedience also of silence, and non contradiction* §. 43.
they allow not, [1] *as due to be yeilded* absolutely to all *Decrees of such Councils.* [*For, if they would but stand to this, the Church's peace were* kept safe *enough*; *for, so, there could never be any reformation (or publick teaching of the contrary) of such Decrees,* as are once *concluded by a* General Council, *but by a following* General Council] [2] *Nor yet as due to be yeilded to* all *Decrees of such* Councils, *that do not err manifestly against some Fundamental verity.*

[‘The Arch-bishop ‖ said this once, (repeated by Mr. ‖ P. 226.
‘*Stillingfleet* ‖) in these words. [*When private men know it, if the* ‖ P. 534.
‘*errour of a lawful General Council be not manifestly against Fundamen-*
‘*tal verity, in which case a General Council cannot easily err, I would*
‘*have* A.C. *and all wise men consider, whether external obedience be not*
‘*then to be yeilded. For, if Controversies arise in the Church, some end*
‘*they must have, or they will tear all asunder*]. This he said once,
‘but did not hold constant to it: for after, in the same Section. ‖ ‖ P. 227.
‘he saith; [*Unless it err manifestly, and intollerably*; --- *and* --- *if the*
‘*errour be neither* Fundamental [then he adds] *nor in* it self ma-
‘nifest, *it is safer to agree*, &c. *For were non-contradiction thus*
‘*far yeilded, seeing that neither the Catholick Church before* Luther, *nor*
‘*her Councils, have been held to have erred* manifestly against *any Fun-*
‘*damental verity (for so it would have lost the very essence of a Church),*
‘*therefore all her subjects whatever would have stood obliged to her, and*
‘*to her Councils, in the external obedience of silence at least; and thus*
‘*her peace been always secure, and undisturbed.*] *But only this*
silence to be yeilded to such Decrees, wherein the errour of the Council is
not manifest, *or* intolerable: *Or* (as Mr. *Stillingfleet* ‖ expresseth ‖ *Still.* p. 560.
it) *where the errour is not such, as* overweighs the peace of the Church. Now they affirm: that many errours, that are not in Fundamentals, or necessaries strictly taken, may be such. For the Catholick (or if you will, the *Roman*) Church that was immediately before *Luther*, they hold, erred not in Fundamentals; and yet they made a Reformation from it, as, mean while, erring many errors *manifest*, and *intolerable*; and they see it necessary to add these *manifest* errors to the other *Fundamental* errors, so to justifie the Protestant's (former) proceeding.

But here again: if a *contradiction*, and breach of external §. 44.
obedience, or of silence in respect of such (imagined) *manifest*,

and *intolerable* errors, were only allowed so far, as to the making a *peaceable complaint*, and representation thereof to their Ecclesiastical Superiors in present Being, for the assembling of another Council of equal authority to reverse it: (which is also mentioned by the Archbishop ‖ and Mr. *Stillingfleet* †): and then, that, if these Superiors see no force in their Reasons, these Plaintiffs should here *acquiesce*, and return to their obedience of *silence*; thus also, the peace of the Church would be still continued.

‖ P. 227.
† 537.

[And this seems still the more equitable, because the Protestant Writers, ‖ *For preventing the exorbitances (as they say) and capricious humours of fantastical Spirits* †, *and for the shutting out the whirl-winds of private Spirits from ruffling the Church* ‖, *do oblige those, who thus break silence, to bring* demonstration *against such errours*; and then, for the shutting out *pretended* demonstrations also, of which the world is full, define this demonstration to be such an evidence; as *proposed to any man (and therefore to these Superiors) and understood, the mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent unto it*; And therefore hence, one would think, when these Superiors upon this proposal do not assent, the complainer ought to presume, his reasons, tendred to them, to be no demonstrations.]

‖ Ap. *Lawd* p. 245. --*Hooker* prefat. p. 29.
† *Still.* p. 540.
‖ Ap. *Lawd* p. 245.

§. 45. But next; neither is this obedience of silence yeilded obligatory in such a case; *i. e.* after that such complaint is made, and that the Superiors declare, they see no just cause for it, nor reason demonstrative in it; but they further maintain *That a former General Council erring manifestly, and intolerably* [*i. e.* in the imagination, and setled fancy of such a particular, person, or Church]; *and the present Superiors* (*complained to*) *neglecting to call, or procure another General Council, to reverse such error, then an authority inferiour may oppose, and publickly contradict such errors of a former General Council; and an* inferior *Synod, National, or Provincial, for themselves may rescind such Decrees, and reform against them* ‖. [For indeed this gap must necessarily be left open, to let in *Luthers* reforming in the points mentioned §. 26. against the Decrees of several former Councils, that had found before in the Church a General acceptation (for they maintain ‖ also, the whole Church liable to error in all such points, as they think fit to call *Non-necessaries*); and against the very *publick Service* of the whole Catholick Church, which was in the Protestant computation, at *Luthers* appearance, of 900 years standing.]

‖ Ap. *Lawd* p. 227. --Mr. *Still.* p. 534. 479.
‖ See before §. 34.

And if a National, or Provincial Synod may claim such priviledge to reform against a former *General Council*; I see no reason, why (much more) a *Province* may not claim it against a National Synod; a *Diocesse* against a Provincial; a *Presbyter* against his Diocesan

Diocesan, because these *inferior* Synods are still more liable to *manifest*, *intolerable* errors: And the Fundamental Reformation, by *Luther*, was the lowest of these, the Reformation of a *Presbyter* against his *Diocesan*.

§. 46. Lastly, there remains yet one considerable more, as to qualifying this licence of publick *contradicting*; which, as it seems most reasonable; so, if it were observed, the Church's Unity, and Peace would yet suffer, by such contradictions, or reformations, no great diminution, or damage: Namely, that those *inferiours* only, who think they can *evidence*, and *demonstrate* the errors of such Councils, may claim the priviledge to speak, and teach publickly against them, or joyn with those that do so; but yet that so many, as do not pretend to have the like evidence, or demonstrations against the Superior's Doctrine, be instructed, that they stand so long obliged, in such case, to relinquish the *Inferior's*, and still to adhere, and submit to the *Superior's*, judgement. [For Example: The *Bishop*, or a *Provincial* Council teaching one thing; the *Metropolitan*, or a *General* Council another; that so many of such Dioceses, or Province, as cannot demonstrate what the Bishop, or Provincial Council maintain, know, that they are bound to continue their obedience still to the *Metropolitan*, or *General Council*, not to the *Provincial Council*, or *Bishop*]: For thus; there would be no more deserters of such Councils, and the former Church's Communion; no more Members of the Reformation, than are themselves pretenders of Demonstration; and those, I suppose, would not be many. But so it is, that these *inferior Guides* justify their *reforming* not only for themselves, but for all their Subjects too; so far as now, within their several Precincts, to impose an obedience of silence upon all, toward them, that cannot demonstrate against them.

This concerning the Protestants claimed liberty, * of breaking the obedience of *silence*; * of *complaining*; * of *reforming*, for themselves, upon neglect of their complaints, errors of Councils, supposed by them manifest, and intolerable.

§. 47. 12ly. Since errors *intolerable*, and *manifest* (they affirm) may be in any Decrees whatever of Councils, if such Councils be not (in their sence) uinversally accepted; or, of such also, as are so accepted, if their Decrees be made in *non-necessaries*: Next they contend, *That the* judgment, *when such* Decrees *of past Councils are errors, and those* intolerable, *and* over-weighing a peace, *and so these publickly contradictible and reformable, is to be left to every* particular, person, *or* Church. ‖ But

‖ See *Still.* p. 539. 292.

But, because this may seem of very ill consequence; Hear, how it is bounded and restrained. This judgment (then) not so left to them (saith the *Arch bishop*); That every private spirit may fall on reforming, what errors he fancies such; but that they bring such *Evidence*, and demonstration, as is described before,‖ proving such to be manifest and intolerable errors: and then again, that the *judgment* of such demonstration, brought by them, be left to a future *Council*: which Council not allowing them for such, these inferiours are to acquiesce, as to silence at least, in its judgment. *For* (saith he ‖) *if the Demonstration be evident to any man* [*according to the former definition they give it*] *then to so many Learned men, as are in a Council, doubtless: And if they cannot but assent to it, it is hard to think them so impious, that they will define against it. And if that which is thought evident to any man, be not evident to such a grave Assembly, it's probable, it is no Demonstration; and the producers of it ought to rest, and not to trouble the Church.* Thus he.

‖ §. 44.

‖ Ar. *Lawd* p. 246.

But 1st. if the Ecclesiastical Superiours, upon this complaint neglect to call such Council, the Arch-bishop then makes every particular person, or Church, Judges, themselves, of their Demonstrations; upon which, he saith, They may proceed to reform, for themselves, such errors ‖. But, say I, if the Demonstration be such, as is evident to any man, then so will it be to these Superiors complained to; and then, here the producers of it ought to rest. But this, he saw, would *presently*, stop the passage to all *Reformation* against *Superiors*; whereas the Council appealed to, (especially, such as they will allow) they see, is far enough off, from checking their pretended evidences: For what *future* Council can ever be hoped for, that will not be liable to most of their exceptions made against that of *Trent*; for the place; or for the calling of it; or for the Voters in it, *&c?* and, till then, every private man's or particular Church's demonstrations, as to reforming, stand in their full force, Power, and Vertue, in the Arch-bishop's stating this Point. But then 2ly. Imagine we such a second Council called; and this, for the lawfulness, and proceedings thereof, void of exception; yet can it end no controversie any more, than the former; nor is it more free from appeals; for, so long as this future Council, as well as the former, is liable to errors *manifest*, and *intolerable*, even in necessaries, if it be not universally accepted; or in non-necessaries, though it be so; it followes, that such errours may be by private men discovered; and new evidences out of the Scripture, or new demonstration may appear against them; and so, upon the former terms, must be admitted a new

‖ Ar. *Lawd* p. 245. & 227. ---comp. §. 33. Consid. 6. *n.* 1. with §. 32. *n.* 5.

new complaint, and a new appeal to *another* future Council. For such resting of a former person in the conclusion of the Council, after his evidences heard and disallowed, inferrs not an acquiescence of all other persons whatever; or yet, of the same person, whenever any other evidence, or demonstration, may appear to them, either against any other Definition of that Council, or even against that, which others upon mistaken grounds, questioned causlesly; for why may not one bring a true evidence, or demonstration, against a point, and so ought to be heard; after that, another, or the same, person hath brought a false, and so is silenced? Thus is the freeing men from the Laws of their Superiors, like the breaking out of waters, by no device afterward to be stopped, where, or when we please. So, many evidences and demonstrations against a corporeal *Presence*, being long ago presented to several Councils, & rejected as false, yet still new ones (or indeed the same) are pretended, to keep the controversie on foot, and bring it to another trial, where the Judge may be better informed.

§. 48.

After the Arch-bishop, Mr. *Stillingfleet* speaks to the same matter, on this manner. ---- *If you ask* (saith he) ‖ *how it should be known, when errors are manifest, and intolerable, and when not? We here appeal to Scripture interpreted by the concurrent sence of the Primitive Church, the common reason of mankind, (supposing the Scripture to be the Rule of Faith); the consent of wise, and learned men; which certainly will prevent the exorbitances, and capricious humours of fantastical spirits which may cry out; That the most received Truths, ever since Christianity was in the world, are intolerable errors. If you are resolved farther to ask; Who shall be judge, what necessary reason, or demonstration is? His Lordship tells you, I think plain enough from* Hooker, *what is understood by it*; viz. *such, as being proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent unto it. And do you require any other Judge, but a mans own judgement, and reason, in this case? But you say; Others call their Arguments Demonstrations: But, let them submit to this way of tryal, and they may soon be convinced, that they are not: Still you say; They will not be convinced, but will break the peace of the Church; supposing, they have sufficient evidence for what they do. But, if men will be unreasonble, who can help it?* Thus Mr. *Stillingfleet*: I have set the place down at large, that you may better consider, what it amounts to. Here then: you see, he restrains this *particular person's*, or *Church's* judgement of the *intolerableness* of such Councils error so, That this judgement be guided, or made, 'According to the interpretation of Scripture, by the concurrent sence of the Primitive Church ‖ p. 539.

Church, [1] According to the common Reason of mankind, supposing Scripture the rule of Faith, [2] According to the consent of Wise, and learned men. But first, methinks it is a very presumptuous thing for *Inferiors* to judge, by any of these three ways, against a *General Council*. As if (for the first) these Councils did not Guide themselves by the concurrent sence of the Primitive Churches; several of which Councils are reprehended by Protestants, for joyning *Church-Tradition* with *Scripture* it self, as a Rule of their Proceeding. And again; as if the concurrent sence of the Primitive Church did either; for what is found to be generally held by it, or what is found not to be so, condemned by it, (according to the Protestants, or Mr. *Stillingfleet's* Principles) certainly clear any thing from being an intolerable error; when as they hold, such *concurrent sence* may err in *Non-fundamentals*: and again hold, that, amongst these not Fundamentals, may be *intolerable* errors. See before, §.25. Next, as if (for the 2d.) General Councils did not use the same common Reason of mankind, and the same Rule of Faith, as a private man doth, for discerning errors: Or, as if he, by his *common Reason* Paramount, could discern, where their *common Reason* mistakes; and that, *manifestly*, and *intolerably*. Or, as if (for the 3d.) in these Councils were not a consent of wise, and learned men: Or, he knew other men more learned, than they; or knew learned men better, than they.

§.49. But, to let these things pass: Yet, since the exorbitant, and capricious humours of some phantastical men may pretend any of these, *Antiquity*; *common Reason* of Mankind, grounded on Scripture; or *the Learned*, on his side, against a General Council, most falsely, and sillily (of which who seeth not many Examples?) Therefore, here it will not be enough for any, to say this; but they are in all reason to shew some Evidence or Demonstration; that these 3. or any of them, are for them. And then, the same Question returns again on Mr. *Stillingfleet*, who shall judge of this pretended *Evidence* or *Demonstration* of theirs? And he, both takes notice of it here, and answers it (if I understand Him aright) thus, That that man's own Reason, that pretends them, is also to be judge of them. For, if a *Demonstration* be such, as being proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot chuse, but inwardly assent to it, then his mind also, that proposeth it, is thus convinced by it, and so knows it to be a Demonstration. And——*Do you require* (saith he) *any other Judge, but a Man's own Judgment and Reason, in this case?* But such collection is very faulty: Because if it be true, that Demonstrations such as

can

can be made in Divine matters) do *always* convince the mind, or effect its full assent: Yet it is not so, that Demonstrations *only* do this; but so also do many other false, though specious, Arguments, I mean, so convince the mind of some, as to produce a full assent, free from doubting, though not from erring. But, to warrant any thing a right Demonstration (according to the former Definition of it), not one, but all mens Reasons, that hear it, must assent to it; and then, amongst these, the reason also of our Superiors; and then, any one mans reason, as to a Demonstration, is sufficiently disproved, whenever all other reasonable men, to whom it is related, judge not the same with him. But, if *some mens* reason, when at any time opposing the *more common*, may be pretended a sufficient judge of Demonstrations: Then we stick still at our former Question, How will this prevent the exorbitances, and capricious humours of phantastical Spirits? And how will not some break the peace of the Church still, supposing that they have sufficient evidence for what they say, when they have not? Therefore, after many windings, his utmost answer is. --- *If men will be unreasonable, who can help it?* And so Mr. *Chillingw*‖. --- *If, through his own default, any man judge amiss, he alone shall suffer for it.* --- And--- *Such person endangers both his temporal and eternal happiness* ‖. Well: for such persons, at their peril be it. ‖ P. 59. ‖ P. 100.

§. 50.

But meanwhile; how is the Church's peace, or her wholesome, or also necessary, and Fundamental Doctrines, to be preserved among her Subjects? How these poor Sheep delivered from harkning to, and being seduced by, these new Demonstrators; if such publick Contradictors may not justly be punished, and restrained by her? Or, how may they justly be restrained, if all ought to be left to judge according to the Pandects of the Divine Laws, because *each* Member of the Christian Society is bound take care of his Soul, and of all things that tend thereto, as Mr. *Stillingfleet* tells us ‖. How restrained, (I mean, even as to external obedience, or silence), if the judgement, when or in what things her Councils intolerably err, is *rightly* left to them; and if, so often as they judge them to err, and perswade themselves they have demonstration for it, they may lawfully contradict? Could the Church-Governors justly punish *Luther*, and He justly do that, for which he was punished? Well: To give some satisfaction also to this [the preserving of the Church's peace], thus goes on Mr. *Stillingfleet*---- *We appeal* (saith he ‖) *to the* common Reason *of Mankind; whether it be not a far probabler way, to end Controversies, to perswade them, in disputable matters, to* yeild external obedience *to* ‖ P. 133. ‖ P. 540.

a lawful General Council; than to tell them, they are bound to believe whatever they decree, to be infallibly true. But here he hides, and nimbly passeth over one half, and the more scandalous part, of his Doctrine; and that, which usher'd in the Reformation; that, where a Doctrine of a General Council is *intolerable*, where it seems to any, not a matter disputable, but *error manifest* (of which he knows, who must judge; and how many of the common Doctrines of the Church, before the times of *Luther*, are by Protestants charged to be so: so that such errors are not to be numbred amongst the *raro contigentia* ‖) so often private men, or particular Churches, instead of yeilding the *external obedience*, he here makes shew of, may publickly *contradict* such Councils; and *reform* (I say not, *without them*; for that, Protestants ‖ do bring several proofs, or Examples, in Antiquity; but) *against them:* (for which they bring none.)

‖ See Mr. Stillingfl. p. 535.

‖ Ap. Laud p. 153.

CHAP. V.

13. *Suitably to the Precedents, Protestants declaring Heresie to be an error obstinately maintained against some Fundamental Article of the Faith; without allowing any certain Judge, what Articles are Fundamental, and consequently, what is Heresie,* §. 51. 14. *Declaring Schism, in respect of inferiors to be a separation causeless* (§. 55.); *Or, also (as some more straiten it, a separation in Essentials,* (§. 57.), *from the Communion of other Churches, or of the Church-Catholick: But leaving us no certain Judge, what points are Essentials; or, when the separation causeless; and consequently, when Schism: (Unless, perhaps, he that separates be made by them this Judge). Again, inlarging Schism to Superiors also, so often as by requiring unjust conditions of their Communion, they give their Subjects just cause of a separation,* §. 61. *Where is examined: Whether the Ecclesiastical Superiors, when departing from no other their Superiors, can become, in respect of their Subjects, guilty of Schism,* §. 63. n. 1.

§. 51. 13. LAstly; concerning their stating of *Heresie*, and *Schism*.

1°. For *Heresie*, They do not enlarge it so far, as Catholicks do, ‖ *to all errors knowingly, or obstinately* maintained against any *Church Definitions made in matters of Faith*: But (which helps

‖ See before, §. 16.

to

to remove the charge thereof the farther from themselves) restrain it ‖ *only to those errors, that are against some essential part of the Gospel, or some Fundamental Article of Faith, or such as is plainly revealed by God with a command that all should believe it* †, or is *absolutely necessary to the Salvation of a Christian, and essential to the being of a Church.*

‖ *Chill.* 271. 332.--*Stilling f.* p. 11.
† *Chill.* p. 332. §. 12.

§. 52.

Which *Fundamentals*, or *necessaries*, they will not allow to extend so far, as to all the Articles contained in some of the Creeds ‖: and some fetter them with so many conditions of an *universal* attestation from the Church of all times, as that scarce any former universally accounted Heresie can be found to oppose a Divine Truth, that is, in every circumstance, so qualified; *viz.* such conditions as these ‖: --- *That* all Catholick *writers agree in such a Doctrine, and none of them oppppose it; and agree in the* necessity *of it also to* all *Christians; and that no later Writers, and Fathers, in heats of contention, and opposition of Hereticks, judge it then an Article more necessary, than it was judged before. That all Writers, that give an account of the Faith of Christians, deliver it, not as necessary to be believed by such, as might be convinced, that it is divine Revelation; but as necessary also to be by* all explicitly *believed; That, what all these Writers consent in, be also undoubtedly the* consent *of the* Church *of those ages, wherein they write: Lastly, that it be made appear to be* universally *embraced at all times, and all places, by the Members of the* Catholick Church: *and the opposers thereof, to have been presently disowned as any Members of it.*

‖ See before, § 41. n. 2.

‖ See *Still.* p. 57.

['Somewhat a like Caution Bishop *Taylor* hath put in 'the beginning of his *Dissuasive* ‖, to secure Protestants from re- 'ceiving any detriment to their cause from the *Fathers*, and *An-* 'tiquity; where, after he hath first collected, --- *That the* Roman 'Tenents were not believed, or practised in the three first ages, because 'the Writers of those ages* [few, and compendious] *are silent therein*; '[which is a faulty, Negative, arguing, though the antecedent 'were granted for true]; and then; thus prejudice't the fourth 'age [*i.e.* the time of *Athanasius*, *Basil*, the three *Gregories*, *Chry-* 'sostom, *Jerome*, *Ambrose*, *Austine*, the first General Councils, and the 'first free exercise of Religion, and copious Records thereof] pre- 'judiced it, I say, and the ages succeeding, *That in those times secular* 'interests did more prevail; *and the writings of the Fathers were vast,* 'and voluminous; *full of controversie, and ambiguous sences, fitted to* 'their own times, and questions; *full of proper opinions, and such variety* 'of Sayings, *that both sides eternally, and inconfutably shall bring sayings* 'for themselves respectively. After such prejudices, I say, he adds, *that* 'it is impossible for those of the Roman Church, to conclude from the

‖ c. 1. §. 1. p. 7.

'sayings of a number of the Fathers, that their Doctrine, which they 'would prove thence, was the Catholick Doctrine of the Church; Be- 'cause (saith he) any number, that is less than all, does not prove a 'Catholick consent; and the clear sayings of one, or two of these 'Fathers, truly alledged by us to the contrary, will certainly prove, that 'what many of them (suppose it) do affirm, and which but two or three, 'as good Catholicks as the other, do deny, was not then matter of 'Faith, or Doctrine of the Church; for, if it had, these had been He- 'reticks accounted, and would not have remained in the Communion of 'the Church. Thus, with him, if *one* or *two* of the Ancients, that 'are not therefore at that time accounted *Hereticks* for it; can 'be shewed to dissent, the concurrence of all the rest is held not 'sufficient to prove a Catholick Doctrine in a matter of Faith; nor 'such an accord of them sufficient to be called a *Catholick consent*; 'or such, as that all maintaining the contrary thereof, after it is 'declared by a Council to be such a Catholick Doctrine, will be '*Heresie*: Whereas (contrary) it is manifest; both, that some 'Dissenters from a Catholick Doctrine of Faith (especially if 'not so *universally* evident, as some others are, or a consequential 'that is, in those times, not so much considered) are not there- 'fore guilty of *Heresie*, before a more publick declaration and 'clearing of such points by a Council; (witness S. *Cyprian*, in the 'Point of *Non rebaptization*:) and yet, that the *Doctrine* may be 'truly called *Catholick* before the Council; and the Dissenters 'also perhaps not free from a culpable ignorance therein: For, 'if the dissent of some few Fathers in the Council (as in that of '*Nice*, or *Chalcedon*) hinders not, that a Point may be declared '(then) a *Catholick Doctrine*, neither doth the dissent of some few 'Fathers before the Council hinder, that then it was not a *Catho- 'lick Doctrine*. But to return to Mr. *Stillingfleet*.

Such conditions, they say, must the Point have, in which the Church-Catholick is unerring; and the obligation to believe, and conform to which is universal; and the opposite whereof is *Heresie*; which conditions if you please to apply to the Articles of Faith, opposing the *Arrian*, *Nestorian*, or *Pelagian* Hereticks, you shall finde scarce any of them; but, that the Opposers thereof, upon a deficiency in some of these requisites, may withdraw his obedience thereto without any guilt of Heresie.

But, 2ly. They leave us also still uncertain; *which*, or *how many* these Fundamentals, or necessaries are: Or, who shall judge what points have, or have not, such an *universal attestation*, as they require from the Church? and therefore they leave us also uncertain, what is, or is not, *Heresie*; leave us also uncertain,

by

by whose sentence, and judgement such Hereticks may be restrained, proceeded against, and punished; since they hold Councils no certain Judge concerning these Points, what are necessary, and Fundamentals, or universally attested, what not: and likewise, since they hold these Fundamentals, as to private men, varying according to a sufficient proposal of them; more Points being Fundamental to one, than to another ‖; and consequently *Heresie* in opposing them, varying accordingly; they having cast off also that of the Church, from being a sufficient proposal of any ones conviction therein.

‖ *Chill.* p. 137. *Still.* P. 98. 99.

§. 53. And indeed, if, 1st. Protestants maintain that no Councils or Church, without tyranny, may require *belief*, or *internal assent* from their Subjects to their Definitions, or Articles of Religion, (a practice much exclaimed against in the Church of *Rome*, and, if I misunderstand them not, denied to be lawful, by several reformed); And 2ly. this be granted, that the *holding* of a Tenent contrary to some Fundamental Point, and not only the *outward profession*, and publick maintaining of such a Tenent, is *Heresie*; I see not, how the reformed Churches, though they should declare a particular Tenent to be an Heresie, yet can discover any Heretick whatever, unless he *voluntarily* publish his Heresie; nor how they can, or do, remove any such out of their Communion, or also sacred Orders; if, 1 neither those, who *hold* such Heretical opinions, stand anathematized, by their Canons; nor there may be the exacting from such, entring into Orders, a confession of their *belief*, or an acknowledgement of any *internal assent* to their Articles of Religion: Both which, for such Points, are the practise of the Catholick Church. But, if it be maintained, that this also is the practise of the reformed Churches, or at least this of *England*, why is the requiring of such assent to, and belief of, the contrary of that which she deems Heresie, blamed in the *Roman?*

§. 54. Lastly, the deleription which is made by Mr. *Stillingfleet*, ‖ of that Catholick Church, which our Blessed Saviour instituted in the world (mentioned before §.41.) seems to take away all such Judge upon the earth, by whom Heresie can be discovered, or made known: for, if the Church-Governors cannot prescribe *infallibly*, [*i.e.* infallibly without mistake; for there is no need, that *infallibly* here signifie any thing more] in any Controversie, on which side is Divine Truth; but---- *That men are to be left herein to judge for themselves according to Scripture* [that is, what seems to them out of Scripture to be truth] *because* (*saith he*) *every one is bound to take care of his soul, and of all things that tend thereto*; Then neither could the Fathers of *Nice* Judge concerning the *Consubstantiality*

‖ p. 153.

ſtantiality of the Son (a thing ſtrongly queſtioned) and put it into the Creed. Nor thoſe of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon* judge ſo concerning *one perſon of our Lord, and* 2. *natures*, and put theſe in the Creed; *Judge* I ſay, ſo, as that others can be obliged to hold that to be *Hereſie* in theſe points, which they pronounce ſo. Nor was there then any way to convince the Arrians infallibly of Hereſie: but that they are ſtill to be left to judge for themſelves,---*as bound to take care for their own ſouls, and of all things that tend thereto.* The ſame may be ſaid, much more, concerning *Pelagianiſm*, and other errors formerly condemned for *Hereſie*, which do expreſly oppoſe no Articles in our Creeds. By this way then, an Eccleſiaſtical reſtraint of *external profeſſion* there may be, but none of *belief*, or *opinions*; nor obſtinacy in holding them, where no Obligation acknowledged to hold otherwiſe.

This of thoſe, who expreſs *Hereſie* as an obſtinate error againſt ſome Fundamental, or neceſſary article of faith univerſally atteſted ſuch by the Church in the manner before mentioned.

‖ Of Hereſie §. 2. 11. n p. 70.

But Dr. *Hammond* ‖ ſomewhat more condeſcending, and enlarging the compaſs of *Hereſie*, though he makes it indeed to be *an oppoſition of the* Faith (*in any one, or more branches of it*) *by way of Emphaſis, and excellence, that was once delivered to the Saints, and that was ſet out by Chriſt* (*or his Apoſtles from him*) *to be by all Men believed to their Righteouſneſs, and confeſt to their Salvation.* ‖ §. 5. n. 2. And *an oppoſition of ſuch faith* (ſaith he ‖) *as deſcends to us from the Apoſtles by a Catholick Teſtimony truly ſuch*, i. e. *univerſally in all reſpects*; [1] *of place*, [2] *time, and* [3] *perſons.* Yet [1] doth he ſo expound ‖ See ib. n. 2. 8. 10. this *univerſal* Teſtimony, ‖ as to ſignifie only the conſent of the *moſt*, in *moſt* places, in all, or *moſt* times; *For elſe* (ſaith he †) *there* † §. 5. n. 2. *would be no Hereticks at any time in the World*: [*Viz.* If thoſe only ſhould be held ſuch neceſſary Articles of our faith, which all, none excepted, in all times, do hold.] And again, [2] he makes uſe of the Churches *Councils* for convincing *Hereſies* againſt this faith; *Viz.* of the four 1ſt. General Councils; ſaying, That all the parts of this faith are compleatly comprehended in the *Scriptures*, as *explained* by the Writers of the three firſt ages, and definitions of the four firſt Councils; ſo that in ſum, he who imbraceth all the Traditional Doctrines propoſed by them, embraceth all the neceſſary faith thus univerſally delivered, (which cannot come to the fifth age, &c. but through the fourth and third;) and ſo can be no Heretick. (See 7. §. 6, 7, 8. n.) His words there (n. 7.) are, *Of the Scriptures, of the Creed, and of thoſe four Councils as the Repoſitories of all true Apoſtolical Tradition I ſuppoſe it very regular to affirm;*

affirm; *that the* intire Body *of the* Catholick *Faith is to be eſtabliſhed, and all* Hereſies *convinced*; *or elſe, that there is no juſt reaſon, that any* Doctrine *ſhould be condemned, as ſuch.* And, ſee what is cited out of him, concerning theſe Councils, before, §. 19. and *of Hereſie*, §. 14. n. 10. But here, ſince he admits *Councils* for convincing *Hereſie*, why reſts he in the *four firſt*? and why admits he not *all Councils* in whatever age, (that are of equal authority); for the ſame diſcovery, ſince many *new* errors againſt *tradicive* Faith may ariſe after the four firſt, and the Church's later Councils, accordingly, may teſtifie, and declare the ſame Faith (as occaſions are adminiſtred) againſt them? If it be ſaid, that what is *traditive* in any latter age, wherein ſome later Council is held, was ſo in the third or fourth; and ſo all Hereſie is ſufficiently convinced by thoſe ages; then ſo were the Definitions of the four firſt Councils traditive in the firſt, ſecond, or third age: And therefore what need hath Dr. *Hammond* to add for conviction of *Hereſie*, theſe *four firſt Councils*, which were held after the three firſt Centuries. The ſum is: For convincing Hereſie, either the teſtification of all lawful General Councils is authentical; or not that of the four firſt. But if the Doctor allow all lawful General Councils to be ſo, (as ſomething ſeems ſaid by him to this purpoſe, *Hereſ.* §. 14. n. 1. 2.), Catholicks are at accord with him herein, concerning the *Nature* and *Trial* of *Hereſie*; and the diſpute only remains, whether any of thoſe Councils, that have heretofore defined, or teſtified any ſuch Point of Faith *traditive*, which is oppoſed by Proteſtants, be ſuch *a lawful General Council*. Concerning which, ſee in 1 *Diſc.* §. 36. n. 3. *&c.* --- §. 50. n. 2. --- §. 57. *&c.*

Thus Dr. *Hammond*; reſtraining conviction of all Hereſie within the time of the firſt Councils. But Biſhop *Bramhall*‖ ſeems to be yet more free. --- *I acknowledge* (ſaith he), *that a General Council may make that revealed Truth neceſſary to be believed by a Chriſtian as a point of Faith, which formerly was not neceſſary to be believed*; *that is, whenſoever the* Reaſons, *and grounds produced by the* Council, *or the authority of the Council* (*which is, and always ought to be, very great; with all ſober, diſcreet* Chriſtians) *do convince a man, in his conſcience, of the truth of the* Council's *definition*. And in vindication of the Church of *England*, p. 26. --- *When inferiour Queſtions, not Fundamental, are once defined by a lawful General* Council, *all* Chriſtians, *though they cannot aſſent in their judgements, are obliged to paſſive obedience; to poſſeſs their ſouls in Patience. And they who ſhall oppoſe the authority, and diſturbe the peace, of the* Church, *deſerve to be puniſhed as* Hereticks. Here, though the Biſhop makes not the oppoſers of the Councils definition

‖ In Reply to Bp. *Chalced.* c. 2. p. 102.

definition, for the reason of opposing it, Heretieks, because he holds that no error, but that, which some way overthrowes a fundamental Truth, can be Heretical; and though, in his holding, that Councils may not prescribe what things are fundamental; nor oblige any to assent to their judgment in what they do define, further than their reasons convince them; *He* as the rest, leaves Hereticks undiscoverable; yet he grants, that all are to submit, for non-contradiction, to the determinations of *L. G.* Councils, even in all inferiour points not fundamental; and that the *opposers* deserve to be punished *as Hereticks*; which, if observed by Protestants, would sufficiently keep the Churches peace; and then, concerning the past definitions of such Councils, see what is argued with him, in 1 *Disc.* §.36.*n.* 3. &c. This for *Heresie.*

§. 55. 12ly. For *Schism.* Neither do they enlarge it so far as Catholicks. *That any separation upon what cause soever,* from the external Communion, *of all particular former Churches; or, of our lawful Ecclesiastical Superiors; or, of the whole Church Catholick; is schism.* ‖ *Chillingw.* p. 271. *but restrain it to a separation* culpable, *or* causeless; ‖ (holding that some separation from them may not be so.)

§. 56. But they leave us here again, in uncertainty, between these Superiors, and Inferiors, which of them shall *judge,* when such separation is causeles, when otherwise: and so uncertain of Schism: or also they affirm, that the *Inferiors* are to judge, when their Superiors require unjust things as conditions of their Communion; and so, when a separation from them ‖ p. 292. is lawful, or culpable. Of which thus Mr. *Stillingfleet,* ‖---*Nothing can be more unreasonable, than that the society imposing* [certain] *conditions of Communion should be judge, whether those conditions be just and equitable, or no?* And the same thing may thus be produced from other Protestant-Tenents; For they hold, that the *whole Church is infallible* only in absolute Necessaries, or Fundamentals; errable in other matters of faith; that its Governors, collected in their supremest Councils, may also enjoyne such *errors* as conditions of their Communion; that these errors, at least some of them may be *certainly* and *demonstratively* discernable by Inferiors; and, these complained of, and not amended by Superiors, that they may lawfully separate, in the sence explained before, § 20. from such Communion, wherein these are imposed: *Here* therefore inferiors judge, when the separation is just, when causeless; and upon this account surely no separation will ever be, *I* do not say Schism, but discovered to be Schism, if the *separatist* is to Judge, when it

it is so. But if the *Superiors* are to Judge, when a separation from them, and from their definitions imposed, is *culpable*, or *causeless*, it will either be always judged *such* (which is the Catholicks Doctrine); or such a *granted-just cause* will be removed by these Superiours; and so there will be no *separation* at all. This concerning some Protestants restraining Schism to *culpable*, or *causeless* separation.

§. 57.

Again; some of them there are, who straiten *Schism* yet farther; ‖ *and, making it, a separation only, from other Christians, or Churches, in such things, wherein it is absolutely necessary to be united with them, (which is thus far true)*; then state *this necessary union to consist only in the belief of those Fundamental Articles of Faith, or Doctrine, which are absolutely necessary to Salvation, or essential to the being of a Church.*

‖ See *Stillingf.* p. 331. 357. 359, 251, 290. compar. p. 54. 56. --- *Whitby*, p. 424.

§. 58.

Where they hold it not Schism, to separate from all particular Churches *of the present age* for a Doctrine universally held, and imposed, as a condition of their Communion, because they say, an error may be so imposed. But only Schism, to separate from the *Primitive* and *Universal* Church for Doctrine, 1st. That can be made appear to have been Catholick, and universally received (in the manner expressed before, §. 52.) by the Church of all ages, successively, from the Apostles to the time of such separation. And 2ly. That can also be proved a Doctrine necessary to Salvation, and essential to the being of a Church.

* For the first of these; Mr. *Stillingfleets* words ‖ to this purpose (in answer, to the unlawfulness of reforming former Catholick Doctrines) are---- *It is not enough* (saith he) *to prove any Doctrine to be Catholick; that it was generally received by Christian Churches in any one age; but it must be made appear, to have been so received from the Apostles time; not to say, that* A. D. 1517. *such, and such Doctrines were looked on as Catholick, and therefore they were so: But that for* 1517. *years successively from the Apostles to that time they were judged to be so; and then* (saith he) *we shall more easily believe you*: And p. 357. he saith, *That we are not to measure the Communion of the* Catholick Church, *by the judgement of* all, *or* most *of, the particular Churches of such an age.* And * for the 2d. In the 2d. *Part*, c. 2. proving Protestants not guilty of Schism, (p. 331.) he saith, ---- *Whoso separates from any particular Church (much more from all) for such things, without which that can be no Church, separates from the Communion of the Catholick Church; but he that separates only from particular Churches* [any, or all], *as to such things, which concern not their being, is only separated from the*

‖ P. 371.

Communion of those Churches, not the Catholick. And therefore (saith he) *supposing that all particular Churches have some errors and corruptions in them, though I should separate from them all,* [for such errors; but what if for some truth, though this not Fundamental?] *I do not separate from the Communion of the whole Church, unless it be for something, without which those could be no Churches,*--- And p.358.---- *No Church can be charged with a separation from the true Catholick Church; but what may be proved to separate it self in something necessary to the being of the Catholick Church; and so long as it doth not separate as to these essentials, it cannot cease to be a true Member of the Catholick Church.* This is freely granted: But what are these Essentials to the being of the Church-Catholick? p.357. he saith,--- *That the Communion of the Church-Catholick lies open to all such, who own the Fundamentals of the Christian Faith:* And (p.251.) he saith,---- *All that is meant by saying; that the present Church* [he means Catholick] *is infallible in Fundamentals; is, that there shall always be a Church; for, that which makes them a Church, is the* belief *of* Fundamentals; *and if they believe not them, they cease to be so. That therefore, which being supposed, a Church is; and, being destroyed, it ceaseth to be, is the formal constitution of it; but thus it is, as to the Church; the belief of Fundamentals makes it a Church, and the not belief of them makes them cease to be a Christian Church.* Well: But what are these *necessaries*, or *Fundamentals* of the Christian Faith, that we may know, how long a person, or Church, retaineth the Communion of the Catholick: See (then) concerning this, p.53. 54, 55. ---- *These are such points* (saith he) *as are required, by God, as necessary to be explicitly believed by all, in order to attain salvation.* And which are they?--- p. 56.--- *Nothing ought to be required as a necessary Article of Faith, but what hath been believed, and received for such by the Catholick Church of all ages.*--- And afterward,--- *What hath been admitted into the ancient Creeds.* Here then I take his Tenent to be --- That no more is necessary to render any person, or, Church free from Schism, and a true Member of the Catholick Church, and continuing in its Communion, than the true belief of all Fundamentals, or points absolutely necessary to be believed for attaining Salvation.

§.59. But here also: 1st. These leave us uncertain, how particularly to know, and distinguish these *Fundamentals* and *Essentials*, wherein only is *Schism*, from other points that are not so; or they do infold them all within the compass of the *Creeds*; where also they contend, that they must not be extended to all the Articles

Articles thereof; whence it will follow, that one departing from the Churches Communion, for requiring his assent, as a condition thereof, in respect of some of these Articles, yet will be no *Schismatick*, as they state Schism: Nor none a Schismatick, that is not, even in a Fundamental, an *Heretick*. Again, since several Doctrines there are, that are delivered by all former ages, which yet are not Fundamental, or Essential to Salvation, or to the being of a Church, thus the separating, from all particular Churches, or from our spiritual Superiours, for any doctrine taken for such, will not be *Schism*. So one, that separates from the Communion of his *Superiors*, for their requiring his assent, and conformity to the Episcopal Government of the Church, though he is a Schismatick in Dr. *Hammonds* account ||, yet must be none, in Mr. *Stillingfleets*; unless he will make Espiscopacy, essential to the being of a Church; (concerning which I refer you to his *Irenicum*) and so pronounce the Presbyterian, and Transmarine reformed Congregations, no Churches of Christ. The same may be said of any, separating from the external Communion of his Superiors, requiring of him consent, and conformity to the Definitions of the first four allowed General Councils, *and the* constitutions *of the universal Church of the first, and purest Ages, whether in Government, or other, the like observances, and practises*; which separation is by Dr. *Hammond* || declared Schism; but cannot be so upon Mr. *Stillingfleets* theses; unless all these will be maintained by him *Fundamentals*, and *Essentials* to the being of the Catholick Church, I mean as to faith necessary for her attaining Salvation. Lastly, Mr. *Stillingfleet* saith, || a Church, enjoyning some dangerons errors, as necessary conditions of her Communion, upon Excommunication to those who do not submit, by this becomes divided from the Communion of the Church-Catholick; but then, it is so, without its denying any Fundamental point of Faith; its crimes only being the imposing of some Non-fundamental errors to be believed, upon pain of Excommunication.

|| Schism, p. 163.

+

|| Schim, p. 156. 160.

|| P. 355.

2ly. By their restriction of Catholick Doctrines to those only, which can be made appear to have been *so* received, not only by the Catholick Church of the *present*, but also of *all former* ages from the Apostles, they may *separate* from a lawful *General Council* of the present age, universally accepted, without any guilt of *Schism*, or opposing, by this, any Catholick Doctrine in their sence: (unless they will say; such Councils can define, or the present age universally accept, no Doctrine, but what hath been the explicite Faith of all former ages.) And by such restriction they seem to require most unequal conditions of their obedience

§. 60. n. 1.

and conformity to the present Church-Catholick; when they will allow a necessity of such conformity to no Doctrine of hers, upon any cheaper terms, than the producing a written evidence [and that, I suppose they mean, not of some principles thereof; but of the Conclusion it self] for it, in all ages for 1600 years. A large field chosen, wherein to continue the dispute. Now all *Church-Tradition* is not necessarily *written*; all former *writings*, not necessarily *descending* to the *present* age; and so, many Doctrines may be universal, that cannot be made appear in the Church-Records of every age to be so; and it seems enough, to infer the obedience of Inferiours, if the *Inferiours* cannot shew, in the former Church-Records, the *contrary* doctrine held in any age, to that maintained in the *present*.

§. 60. n. 2. 3ly. If the *Catholick Doctrine* of the present age be in a matter necessary; the Church of the present age must be unerrable in it; and its Testimony sufficient to enforce a conformity, upon pain of *Schism*, without farther search into former ages. (For the Catholick Church of every age is unerring in necessaries.) If in some matter not necessary; the testimony of the Church of all ages (excepting the Apostles only) with them is not sufficient; which (as they say) may mistake in it; and therefore the retiring to these former ages will not be sufficient to prove it a *Truth*; or a departure from it, *Schism*. But if they say; in the testimony of former ages, they include the testimony of the Apostles also; then, that alone will be sufficient to authorize a *Catholick Doctrine*, without the Churches witness given thereto in any age; or, without that the Church's witness is nothing worth: and then, why press they this *universal* Testimony of the Church?

§. 60. n. 3. 4. But lastly, this their affirming, the *Constitution* and *Essence* of the Catholick Church, to be only a *right belief* in *Fundamentals*; and allowing the *Communion* of this *Church*, and a security from *Schism* to all such persons, and Churches, as are in these Fundamentals no way deficient, is very faulty, and contrary to the ordinary notion, which both the ancient Fathers, and Learned Protestants have of the Catholick Communion, and of Schism.

It is true; that as the Catholick Church is a company of right Believers, as to Faith absolutely required for attaining Salvation; no more is necessary to its constitution, or being, than the Faith only of some points, which, for this reason, are called Fundamentals; but, as it is also *One Society*, or *Body*, wherein the several Members are united in the Bond of Peace, under lawful Pastors and Guides, and subjected to certain Laws of Government and Discipline: So, many more things both in respect of

the

the *Plenitude* of *Faith*, and *Sanctity* of *Manners*, according to the divine Revelations, and Commands made known by these his Ministers, are necessary to the *Being*, and *Constitution* thereof; all which being put, any particular Person, or Church is a true Member of the Church-Catholick: But, any of them wanting, though the rest be present, it ceaseth to be *Catholick*. And such a Church-Catholick is affirmed to be always extant, not only as shall *believe* aright in all *Fundamentals*, but the Members of which shall always be *united* also in all other points of *Faith*, and practice of *holiness*, conducing to Salvation; and the subjects therein obedient to their Superiors, in all their lawful decrees, and injunctions. So that a person, or Church, most fully Orthodox, as to all Fundamental Faith, yet may want some *Essentials* of Unity, necessary to the being a Member of the *Catholick* Church, if such person, or Church shall divide from the Communion thereof, for any lawful Definition made, or practice enjoyned, by his Superiors, even in Non-fundamentals. So, the *Novatian*, and *Donatist*-Churches perfectly agreeing with the *Catholick*, as to all Fundamental Faith, yet became non-Catholick, and Schismaticks for relinquishing the Communion of the whole, in opposition to some matters not Fundamental, when once defined, and stated by it; the one, for the reception into the Church of great sinners after Baptism, penitent; the other, for non-rebaptizing of Heretick*s*, converted. Therefore of these later, S. *Austine* saith, ‖---- *Nobiscum estis in baptismo, in Symbolo, in cæteris Dominicis Sacramentis: In spiritu autem unitatis, & in vinculo pacis, in ipsâ deniq; Catholicâ Ecclesiâ, nobiscum non estis.* In *Symbolo*, & *Sacramentis* they agreed; but yet, not in *Catholicâ Ecclesiâ*, because not in *Spiritu unitatis*, & *Vinculo pacis*, *i. e.* not in a due subordination, and subjection, as to some other universal decrees of their Mother, the Catholick Church, in which they were *Heretical*, and *Schismatical* (of which see before, §. 18.) To the compleat *Being* and *Essence* of the Church *qua* Catholick (then), there is required; not only, that there be *unafides*, but *unum corpus* (*Eph.* 4. 4,5.) under subordinate Governors (*verse* 11.); not only *unitas in Symbolo*, & *Sacramentis*, but *it* in *vinculo patis*; as it extends to all obedience, and subjection of Inferiours to their Superiours, of the parts to the Laws, and constitutions of the whole: for want of which later the Donatists, Orthodox as to all Fundamentals, yet are said not to be in *Ecclesiâ Catholicâ*.

‖ Ep. 48.

And these other necessary *properties* of a true Member of the Church-Catholick, besides that of a right belief in Fundamentals, are freely also confessed by learned Protestants. §. 60. n. 4.

Of which

‖ L. 2. c. 2. which thus, Dr. *Field*. ‖--- *This intire profession of the truth revealed in Christ, though it distinguish right Believers from Hereticks, yet it is not* proper [quarto modo] *to the happy number, and blessed company of Catholick Christians, because* Schismaticks *may, and sometimes do, hold an intire profession of the truth of God, revealed in Christ.*---- And afterwards---- *The notes* (saith he) *that perpetually distinguish the true Catholick Church from all other Societies of men, and professions of Religions in the world, are these: First, The entire Profession of those supernatural verities, which God hath revealed in Christ his Son. 2ly. The use of such holy Ceremonies and Sacraments, as he hath instituted and appointed. 3ly. An Union, or connexion of men in this Profession, and use of these Sacraments, under lawful Pastors and Guides, appointed, authorized, and sanctified to direct, and lead them in the happy ways of eternal Salvation.* A particular person, or Church therefore, having the two first properties, yet failing in the last, *a due union, and connexion with the whole under its lawful Superiors* (of which see 2 *Disc.* §. 24.) wants something necessary to the Being of a Member of the Catholick Church. And see also, *l.* 1. *c.* 13. where he denies Schismaticks, to be of the Church [*i. e.* Catholick]; because,--- *Though they retain an* entire *profession of the* truth *of God, as did* (saith he) *the* Luciferians, *and some others, in the beginning of their Schism; yet they break the* Unity *of the Church, and refuse to submit themselves, and yeild obedience to their lawful Pastors and Guides: and their* Communion, *and conjunction with the rest of Gods people, is in some things only; and not absolutely in all wherein they have, and ought to have fellowship.* Thus Dr. *Field*, and much what the same you may find in Dr. *Ferne* ‖ quoted before in 2 *Disc.* §. 24. who, on this account, makes *Presbyterians*, *Schismaticks*. Next see Dr. *Hammands* Treatise of Schism: where, he makes, * that *Unity* of the Catholick Church, of which *Schism* is a breach, to consist,---- *In the preserving all those Relations, wherein each Member is concernd one towards another, amongst which is that of* subordination; *the Unity whereof consists in a constant due subjection, and obedience of all inferiors to all their Superiors*, &c. ‖ --- *and* * *the denying this obedience, in any particular* lawful command *of these Superiors; or the casting off all obedience together, dethroning them*, &c. *to be Schism.* ‖ [But this *lawful command*, and so *Schism*, in disobeying it, may be in no Fundamental point] Lastly, thus Bishop *Branhall*; ‖ *That all Schism is about Essentials of Religion is a strange paradox! Many Schisms have arisen in the Church about Rites and Ceremonies, about precedency, about Jurisdiction, about Rights, and Liberties of particular Churches, about matters of fact.*

‖ The Case between two Churches, p. 48.

‖ C. 9. §. 3.

‖ C. 3. §. 9.

‖ Reply to *Chaled* p. 8.

Obsti

Obstinacy in a small matter, is enough to make a Schisme. From all these I think it is clear; that a separation from the Communion of the Church Catholick, or our lawful Superiours, for any thing true, or lawfull, the practice or belief of which is injoyned by her as a condition of her Communion, though this be not in Fundamentals, is Schisme, and inconsistent with being a true member of the Catholick Church: learned Protestants consenting.

And then; to learn, in matters controverted, and doubtful, what is true, and what is lawful, we know to whose judgment, *Inferiours*, and Subjects are directed to repair: and if they will sit in *Moses*'s chair themselves and judge it, and happen to mistake, I leave them to read their doom in D. *Hammonds* c. 2. of Schisme §8. —— *Now, which way soever they turn, sure to Sin; remaining in* Errour *and* Schisme *on the one side* [if they desert upon this judgment, the Churches Communion] *and, by flying from that, advancing to* lying *and* Hypocrisy *on the other side* [i. e. if they externally profess contrary to their persuasion] This (from §.75.) concerning some Protestants restraining Schisme to a departure in the Essentials of Religion.

§. 61.

But the same persons, though they contract *Schisme* thus, in the case of *Inferiours*; yet in another way they enlarge it, where Catholicks do not admit it; namely to the *Church Governours* themselves. Affirming 1st. 'That they (*even in the supremest Body of them, Lawful General Councills*) *may* err *in non-fundamentalls*; *and impose* unjust *conditions of their Communion, followed with an* Excommunication, *of non-conformists*: And 2ly. That, *so often as they do so, they, in giving such just cause of separation, incurr the guilt of Schisme* ‖: *and thereby do become divided, themselves, from the Communion of the Catholick Church from which they would divide others* †

‖ *Ap. Laud* P. 133. 142.

† *Stillingfleet* P. 356. &c. 359.

§. 62.

For instance; should a *General Council* consisting both of the *Eastern*, and *Western* Churches, and Generally accepted, before the times of *Luther require assent to a Substantial Conversion* in the Eucharist; to the lawfulness of *St. invocation*; to the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass* &c. (as they must grant, that, if both these Churches did not, yet possibly they might, because Protestants say; ' That the whole may err in non-fundamentals; and ² That these points are such); they affirme, That thus, the Governours of the whole Christian world would become *Schismatical*, and no longer *members* of the Church Catholick [' Mr. *Stillingfleets* words to this purpose are these: ‖ ' *Suppose any Church (though pretending to be never so Catholick) doth restrain her Communion*

‖ P. 356.

'munion within such narrow, and unjust bounds, that she declares such 'excommunicate, who do not approve all such errours in doctrine, and 'corruptions in practise, which the Communion of such a Church may 'be liable to; i. e. when the errours, and corruptions are such, as are 'dangerous to Salvation, that Church becomes thereby divided from the 'Communion of the Catholick Church: and all such who disowne such 'an unjust incloſure, do not so much divide from the Communion of that 'Church so incloſing; as returne to the Communion of the primitive 'and universal Church. And (p. 359.) he saith, Whatever Church 'makes such extrinsecall [opposed so essentiall] things the neces- 'sary conditions of Communion, so as to cast men out of the Church, who 'yeild not to them, thereby divides it self from the Catholick Church; 'and the separation from it is so far from being Schisme, that being 'cast out of the Church, on those termes only, returns them to the Com- 'munion of the Catholick Church; and p. 617. he saith, That he 'cannot possibly discerne any difference between the Judgment of the Ca- 'tholicks concerning the Donatists [which Catholicks pronounced them 'Schismaticks, and no members of the Church Catholicks] And of 'the Protestants concerning the Church of Rome. Thus he]

But here 1st. from this assertion, that that Church, which requires unjust things as conditions of her Communion, doth hereupon divide her self; and so becomes divided, from the Church Catholick, and again: that those are unjust conditions of Communion, which Protestants have stiled to be so; It followes. 1st. That, since *de facto* the present Eastern and Greek, as well as Western and Roman-Churches do require as conditions of their Communion, and even in their publick Lyturgies, several things, which Protestants call unjust; therefore the Eastern as well as Western according to their thesis must stand divided from the Church Catholick: and therfore now, only the *Reformed* are that Church Catholick, the perpetual existence of which Church we believe in our Creed. 2dly. Since both these Eastern, and Western, required the very same conditions of Communion, as they do now, before *Luthers* dayes, it followes; that then they were also, no less than now, Schismaticall; and so false from Catholick; (for this, that all people that are their Subjects conform to such conditions, or some not conform, alters not their guilt, who then impoſed such things; or if it do, it seems then the greater, when all do conform, and are misled by them): and upon this again, it followes; that there was then (the Protestant Church not yet born) no Catholick Church at all (contrary to the Articles of our Creed), the whole being involved in Schisme, if all then conformed. ['Of which conformity the Arch-bishop saith,

(and

‖ (and Mr. *Stillingfleet* the same ‖)- ---*That he that believes, as* ‖ p. 296. 297.
'*that Church believed* [speaking of the Roman] *and so may all those* ‖ p. 618
'*be presumed to believe, that live in the Roman Church with a resolu-*
'*tion to live, and die in it, is guilty more, or less of the Schisme, which*
'*that Church first caused by her corruptions, and now continues by*
'*them, and her power together, and of all other damnable opinions too*
'*in point of misbelief, and of all other sins also, which the doctrine and*
'*misbelief of that Church leads him into.* And afterward--------*That*
'*he, who lives in a Schismatical Church, and communicates with it in*
'*the Schisme, and in all the Superstitions, and Corruptions, which*
'*that Church teacheth, nay lives, and dyes in them, if he be of capacity*
'*enough, and understand it, he must needs be a formal Schismatick;*
'*or an involved one, if he understand it not.* Thus he] Or if some (then) did not conforme to what these Guides required, yet it followes at least, that there were (then) no known Ecclesiasticall Governours, and leaders, no Bishops, in, or of, that Church Catholick, that then was, (for we know of none such, that, in the age before *Luther*, opposed such a *conformity*) and, that it was made up of Laicks, and Inferiours; *i. e.* made up only of some *Sheep*, that were departed, and strangled from their *sheepheards*; or rather the sheepheards from them; absurdities, that need be no further aggravated.

But 2^ly. to what is said It is answered 1. That neither can the supreme Guides of the Church Catholick in an approved Council at any time require unjust conditions of their Communion (of which see before §. 21.) And what St. *Austin* ‖ saith of general Church practice, is as, or more, true of her doctrines——*Si quid horum per orbem frequentat* [*or credit*] *Ecclesia, hoc, quin ita faciendum* [*or credendum*] *sit disputare, insolentissimæ insaniæ est.* §. 63. n. 2. ‖ *Epist.* 118. 2. Nor, though this should be granted, and also that they excommunicate those that refuse to conforme, can they thereby become guilty of *Schism.* For 'Schisme, (I mean, such as separates, and divides from the Catholick Church, can never be of a much major, and more dignified part, in respect of a less, and Inferiour, subject to it; *i. e.* the main body be a Schismatick from some single member thereof: for this main body, in any division, is rightly taken for that *whole* (see 2^d. *Disc.* §. 25.); from which a separation is Schisme; and to which every member ought to adhere, as to the body, and the head here upon earth to which it belongs. The sin of Schisme, I say, is of a *member* departing from the Body, not of the *Body* separating, from a member, (or separating a member from it) to which each member ought to conforme; otherwise a division in the Church indeed may be

seen; but, on what side the crime of Schisme is, cannot, by any certain Index of it, be known; And St. *Austin's* ‖ mark of Schismaticks ---- *Quorum communio non est cum toto, sed in aliquâ parte separatâ*, will be fallacious, and nothing worth. Meanewhile it is not here denyed, that the dividing of *one* or *several* Superiours from an Inferiour part, if it be for any thing, wherein such part, not they, doth agree with the whole, may be Schisme; but then that, which makes this *Schisme*, is the departure of such Superiours from their *Superiours*, or from the *whole*, with which this *part* coheres; and when any Superiour makes any *such* division from his Subjects, he is no longer their lawfull Superiour; but that larger body and those Superiours of his, to which his Subjects are joyned; and from which he divided. ² Again, since Schisme is alwaies a relinquishing of and departure from, the *external*, and *visible* Communion of the Church, these Governours cannot be said to depart from that Communion, which they still retaine in the same manner, as formerly, and which is the only visible Communion of the Church, at the time of such excommunication. External members of the Church therefore they still remaine, and so no Schismaticks; though all the same persons, or many of them, by some other mortall sin, may be, at the same time, no internal members of it.

‖ *De unitat. Eccle.* c. 4.

§. 62. n. 3.

3. And as they cannot be rightly called *Schismaticks*, or persons divided from the Church-Catholick: So neither can such *Superiours*, by imposing some error on mens belief, or by inflicting an unjust Excommunication, be therefore said to be the *cause* of a *Schism*, or an actual separation in others, as they are often charged ‖; unless to be excommunicated be such, for the Church concurs to no other separation. If any, so Excommunicated, doth not quietly submit thereto, and acquiesce therein with patience, but proceed so much further, as to set up, or joyn himself with, a Communion diverse from that of the former Church, which he is expelled from; or presumeth to exercise out of the Church those Ecclesiastical Functions, which she hath (though wrongfully) suspended, here indeed begins a faulty separation, and a *Schisme*; but by the fault of the excommunicated, not of the Church, that unjustly Excommunicates him; but doth not thereby necessitate him to any such further removal, or discession from it. Had he rested in the place, where the Church left him, the Church had been *faulty* indeed, he innocent; but on no hand a *Schisme*: and if he will not stay here, but set up an *Anti-communion*, and fall on acting against the Church that expelled him, here he cannot defend the doing a wrong, because he hath suffered one;

‖ *Ap. Laud* P. 133. 142.

or

or justly disburden on the Church that fault of his, to which no fault of theirs necessitated him. *Sæpe finit divina providentia (saith St.* Austin ‖ *) expelli de congregatione Christianâ etiam bonos viros. Quam contumeliam vel injuriam suam cum patientissime pro Ecclesiæ pace tulerint, neq; ullas novitates, vel Shismatis vel Hæresis moliti fuerint, docebunt homines, quantâ sinceritate charitatis Deo serviendum sit &c. Neq; ullas novitates, vel Schismatis &c*; Therefore, whilest only an unjust excommunication past, there is no *Schisme*, as yet. This, that the Church-Governours, by an unjust excommunication, do make no external division of themselves from the Church Catholick, nor yet, necessitate *any active* separation of others.

‖ De veâ Religione, c.6.

4. Lastly, Neither doth it hold, that those Governors do *internally* divide themselves from the Church Catholick by every such act, whereby they do externally (but not internally) cut off another person innocent from it: Supposing indeed, that after all such Ecclesiastical excision *whatever*, the two parties can no longer remain members of the *same* body, this were most true, that he (as being innocent) remaining still a member of *Christs body*, they must cease to be so; but so it is, that the Excommunication of an innocent may happen by many accidents, without any fault of the Excommunicators; or, if a fault, no *mortal* one, and such, as *internally* separates from the Body of Christ. Thus much be said of the Protestant Notion of *Heresie* and *Schism*.

§. 63. n. 4.

CHAP. VI.

A Reflection on the former different Theses, of the two Churches concerning Church-Authority, and the Obedience due thereto. §.64.

*And a Review, which of them most resembles the ancient Catholick Church §.67. The face * of the ancient Catholick Church,* Ibid. ** Of the present* Roman *Church, §.72. * Of the present Protestant Churches, §.76.*

§. 64. *Reflection.*

THus much of the chief Differences of the two Churches concerning *Church-authority*, and the *obedience* due thereto. Where I think the disinterressed, and considerative may clearly see. 1st. That, for that, wherein the Arch-bishop, and others, have appeared to Catholicks not able to

extricate themselves [*viz.* in their maintaining a *Church-authority* for *deciding* all Controversies, and suppressing all Sects; and, with it; the *liberty* of Inferiours publickly *contradicting*, and reforming against this authority, whenever in their judgment, thought *manifestly* erring.] Mr. *Stillingfleet's* new defence hath no way relieved them, but left their difficulties in their former state.

§. 65. 2ly. That the one, the Catholick way here above mentioned, maintaines *obedience*, and constant submission of private judgments, and so tends effectually to preserving Christian Religion, and Faith still the same, and united, as it descendeth through several ages; but the other maintains *liberty* of private judgements, and so continually varies, and divides it; That the one builds, and sets up *Ecclesiastical authority*, and its supreme Tribunals, *the Councils*; The other, by several ways, goes about to weaken, and frustrate it, and them; whilst it makes Councils Judges, and deciders of Controversies; and then private men Judges, whether the Councils have judged right, or erred in their decisions; and whilst, by asking many questions, and moving many scruples, (some of which I have set down below ‖), they * endeavour to make a General lawful obligatory Council, in the former ages, to be a thing very rare, and difficult to be found; or certainly known: [‘*Have Pastors, & Doctors met in Oecumenical* ‘*Councils in all ages? I wish you could prove a truly Oecumenical* ‘*Council in any age*, saith Mr. *Stillingfleet* ‖. And--- *It is evident*, ‘*we never had a general Council*.--- And--- *A General Council is a* ‘*thing impossible*, saith Mr. *Whitby* ‖.--- And--- *These, and a hundred* ‘*questions more* (saith he), *of the persons appointed to call them, of* ‘*the place, and the like, might be insisted on to shew, that General* ‘*Councils were never instituted by God, for the rule of our Faith.*] And, when such Council found, * give them as little comfort, or confidence in it, by their taking much pains, and spending a great part of their Books, to shew, and prove the liability of these Councils to error, even in Fundamentals. All which is but the telling an intelligent disinterested person, that neither such Councils, as could heretofore be assembled, have been their friends, nor the future are hoped to be so.

‖ §. 86. &c.

‖ P. 253.

‖ P. 433.

§. 66. Lastly, they may see, that if the former, the Roman-Catholick, way be taken; all, or most of those *Controversies* between *Catholicks*, and *Protestants* have been decided by those Councils, which, before the times of *Luther*, the whole Western Church (in which the Controversies arose) unanimously accepted, and allowed; (an instance hath been made in the 1st. *Disc.* (§. 57.) touching

ing Transubstantiation.) Or also several of them, by the very *publick service* of the whole Catholick Church; *a Service*, as universally accepted, as the Councils. But if the later, the Protestant, way be taken, these *Controversies* must still remain; and the way is open for any particular person, or Church (according to their apprehension of the magnitude of the Churches errors, and of their certainty of this) to raise more, till the end of the world.

There remain yet two things, that seem necessary to be added, before I conclude the discourse. 1 The one; a brief Survey of the different constitution, and complexion of these two *present* Churches compared with the *ancient*, and Primitive; to see which of them more resembles her; and which seems rather to be her true daughter, to whom both pretend as their *Mother*; that we may not demur to render our selves wholly to her conduct, on whom we perceive to have descended the vigor, spirit, and authority of the ancient Church. 1 The other, a removal of, and vindication of her from, those many objections, and Articles, that are drawn up against her, why she cannot afford, to any, that certain direction, and salvifical security, which they expect from her.

§. 67.

A Review of the two present opposite Churches; which most resembles the ancient Catholick.

For the perfect discovery then of the former of these, 1st. If we look back 1 To the Scriptures; and 2 To the Primitive times (to discern if we can from thence, in this present division of Churches, which of them rather have the true notes, and marks of the Church-Catholick), We find *the Evangelical Church*, described in the one, and acting in the other, with very great Authority, and most sacred Majesty.

1. *The face of the* Ancient Catholick Church.

Of his Evangelical Successors, that He left behind him, our Lord pronounceth---- *He that heareth you, heareth me* Luk. 10.16. and--*If any man heareth you not* [in matters of controversy brought before you] *let him be, as a Heathen, and a Publican*, Matt. 18. 17. Of these he declares---- *Quæ ligaveritis, & solveritis super terram, erunt ligata* &c. *& in cælo.* Matt. 18.18.--And--*Quorum peccata solveritis, aut retinueritis, remittentur* &c. Jo. 20. 23. Of this Church it is said; That it shall be * *a City placed on a hill, and a candle put on a Candlestick, and not covered under a Bushel* Matt. 5. * *The pillar of Truth* 1. Tim. 3. 15. *And the foundation of God, which standeth ever sure* 2. Tim. 2. 19. * *An uniforme* Building *raised upon its corner stone* Christ. Ephes. 2. 21. *And*, * *a* Body, *with joynts, and ligaments, deriving nourishment one from another, firmly knit together, under its Head*, Christ, Col. 2. 19. * *A* Government *constituted by God, founded, and compacted* [in a due subordination] *to keep all its members in the*

the unity of Faith, from being tossed too, and fro, with several Doctrines, Eph. 4. 11, 13, 14, 16. --- *And,* * *perpetually to the worlds end, assisted with the Paraclet sent from our ascended Lord, to give them into all truth,* Jo. 14. 16, 26. * which Governors who so resisteth, is in this rendred *self-condemned, Tit.* 3. 11. Lastly, * S. *Peter* entitled to some special presidence over this whole Church by those Texts, --- *Tu es Petrus, & super hanc Petram,* Mat. 16. --and --- *Rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua: Tu confirma fratres,* Luk. 12. 2. 32. --- and --- *Passe oves meas, Jo.* 21. 10. compared with *Gal.* 2. 7. Where thus S. *Paul,* --- *The Gospel of the Uncircumcision* was committed to me; *as to* Peter (saith he, relating to the *Pasce* in S. *John*) *was committed the Gospel of the Circumcision*: where it is observable also; that, then, was the *Circumcision* the *whole* flock of Christ, when it was committed to *Peter*: *St. Peters* Commission over Christs sheep being ordinary, given by our Lord here on Earth, (who also had the honour of the first converting and admitting of the *Gentiles* into this fold ‖); *St. Paul's* over the *Gentiles*, extraordinary, given by our Lord from Heaven ‖. And this Commission *manifested* to the *Apostles* by a supereminent *Grace* of converting Soules, and of Miracles, that was bestowed upon him, (*Gal.* 2. 8. 9.) Like to that more eminently given to St. *Peter*; as may be seen in *Act.* 9. 40. and 20. 10. *Act.* 5. 15 and 19. 12. 5. 5. and 13. 11. 2. 41. 4. 4. and *Rom.* 15, 17, 18, 19. compared. And that, which is said *Gal.* 2. *That the Apostles saw the Gospel of the Circumcision committed to* Peter, argues, they saw it committed to *Peter* in some such special or superintendent manner, as not also to them.

‖ *Act.* 10. 34-11 2--15. 7.

‖ *Act.* 9. 6--22. 17. 21.

§. 68. Again; If we look upon the constitution, and temper, and manner of practice, of this Church, in the primitive times.

From the very first we find it acting (as St. *Paul* directed Arch-bishop *Titus c.* 2. 15) *Cum omni imperio: ut nemo contemnat*; Severely ejecting, and delivering to Satan, after some admonition, those that were heterodox, and heretical. ‖ In matter of controversy, a Council called, and the stile of it, *Visum est Spiritui Sancto, & nobis*, and --*Nobis collectis in unum:* ‖ And if here it be said, that the infallible Apostles had some hand therein; yet if we look lower, we find still the same authority maintained, and exercised by the Catholick Church of latter ages; and especially by that of the 4th age; when, flourishing under the patronage of the secular power (now become Christian) if fully enjoyed (as also the present doth in these *Western* parts) the free exercise of its Laws, and Discipline.

‖ 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. *Tit.* 3. 11-1. 11.

‖ *Act.* 15. 25. 28

§. 69. In all these times then 1st. We find the unquestioned Church Catholick of those dayes firmly joyned with, and adhering to, that, which was then ordinarily stiled Κατ' ἐξοχήν *the See* Apostolick and St. *Peters chaire*, and with the *Bishop* called

his

his Successor; as if *Matt.* 16. 18. and *Luke.* 22. 23. were a prophecy thereof: though some other of the greatest *Patriarchs* stood not so firm, but that the Catholick Church in those dayes relinquished, and cut them off. We find the same Church, when any opposition of its Doctrines happened, (as it was, then, exercised with the highest controversies that ever troubled the Church), taking very much authority upon it self; assembling it self in a *General* Body; making new *definitions*, as necessity required; *anathematizing* all *dissenters*; inserting (as it saw meet, for the more explicit knowledge of them by all its subjects) some of its *decisions* in the Churches *Creeds*; which were by it much enlarged, from what they were formerly. We find it declaring this also in the Creed concerning it self, and enjoyning it to be believed by all Christians, that the *Catholick Church* continues always *Holy*; *Apostolical* [preserving their Rules, Traditions, and Doctrines]; and *One*; [*indivisa in se*: united in its faith and *Communion*; and *divisa ab omnibus aliis*; distinct from all others, whom she declares *Hereticall*, or *Schismatical*.]

§. 70. 2. Again: we find it, by such *definitions* put in the *Creed*, and *Belief* of them exacted, sufficiently declaring also; that it held it self to be (I say not; *proving that it was*: against which only, perhaps misunderstanding his adversary, Mr. *Stillingfleet* disputes ‖) *infallible*, or actually unerring in *them*. ‖ p. 558.

['Thus much is clear, I say, concerning the Catholick 'Church, and her General Councills of those times; that they held 'themselves infallible in the things they defined; and, if the *testi-* 'mony, and *veracity* of the *Catholick Church* (or her *united Gover-* 'nours) in what she then professed, (as of other things, so) of her- 'self, can obtain no belief with some protestants, either from the 'witness, that *Church-Tradition*, (grounded at first on miracles), 'or that the *Scriptures*, or some other sufficient evidence in point of 'reason ‖ which Mr. *Stillingfleet* ‖ is contented with, gives to it; ‖ See before §. 8. '(of which see below, §. 87. &c.) Yet Protestants must grant, that ‖ p. 559 'the *present* Catholick Church (which or where ever it is) should 'it profess it self infallible, errs now only the same errour, which 'the *ancient* Church-Catholick did, before it. And, if here it be 'thought, that this may qualify some thing concerning the for- 'mer Church, that by this way it declared not it self infallible, uni- 'versally, but only, in those things it defined; so I say, neither 'doth the Church-Catholick of the present age profess her self in- 'fallible, save in her Definitions: Nor requires she of her defi- 'nitions any other belief, than the ancient Church did of hers. 'Nor matters it, whether this certainty of the truth of her defini-

tions

c tions ariseth from the *evidence* of the former *Revelation*, and *Tra-*
c *dition* of such points defined; or from our *Lords promise*, that in
c her definitions she shall not err. See before, §.10.] To proceed.

§.71. 3. We find it, * declaring those *Heretick*s, who opposed any of those definitions, and expelling them from the Catholick Communion; most strict, by *Synodical* and *Communicatory* Letters, in preserving, in all points once defined, the *Unity* of the Catholick *Faith*; and most carefully separating from any person suspected of any Heterodoxness, or division from it. * Proceeding in its *censures*, not only against some private persons, but against *Churches*, against *Bishops*, against *Patriarchs* themselves; yet such, as then also failed not to pretend a dutiful continuance in the Faith of former ages; and appealed to the former (short)Creeds, and Confessions of Faith. Such authority the Church, *Fallible*, or *infallible*, then presumed to use; *cum omni imperio*, and punishing all contempt.

§. 72. 2. *The Face of the* present Roman Church. If we look, next, on the two present *Bodies*, or combinations of Churches, that flourish at this day in that part of the world, where Christian Religion now (as anciently) enjoys its *freedom*, to see, which of them resembles the constitution, aspect, and manners, of the ancient Catholick Church; we find them of a very different temper, proportion, and pretentions. One of them by much the greatest, and, through the Universe, most dilated, Body, and Communion that is in Christianity; I mean such, as is united in the same Government, Laws, Faith, and Discipline, with a certain subordination of all the Members and Officers thereof one under Ecclesiasticall Head. So that if we suppose *the Church-Catholick* (where are many divided Christian Societies, or confederacies separated from one another in their Communion,) to be but one, (unanimous Body), of them: (concerning which see 2 *Disc.* §.26. n.1.---§.27. n.3.); and it again to be, for universality, the greatest of those bodies; this must be it. And again, if we suppose a General Council assembled of all these, its votes would have the predominancy over any of the rest, taken a part; and, in any conjunction of them all in such a meeting, it may reasonably be imagined, from the agreement, which the most considerable of the other Churches have with it in most of the *Western Controversies*, that, in voting them, its party would be increased sooner, than any other.

§. 73. Again: This great Body also, we find, hath continued, to this day, united to, and joyned with, the *See Apostolick*, and Chair of S. *Peter*, like that Church-Catholick, in the Primitive times

times. And we find it using its authority still after the same manner, as (then) did the true Catholick Church: still, pretending it self (upon our *Saviours promises*) in its supreme *Councils*, joyned with the authority of the same *Chair*, a certain and infallible Guide in the determination of all necessary Faith; to whom all its Subjects owe not only *silence*, but submission of judgement, and *belief*. We find it, from time to time (as the ancient Church), when any new Controversies, Opinions, and Sects arise any way dangerous, making *new* definitions, and more explications of the Catholick Faith; and enlarging from age to age (for which also its adversaries complain of it) the particular, and explicite knowledge, and profession thereof amongst her Children, as the Heterodox grow more particular, and multiplicious, in those errors, that would any way undermine it: as also anciently the *Nicene* Creed was thought a necessary supply to the *Apostolick*; and again, the larger (*Athanasian*) to the *Nicene*, Creed. And these her definitions, now, as then, she passeth under *Anathema* to opposers, or dissenters; declares *Hereticks*, still, (as they were esteemed anciently) such, as oppose them; because such, after them, judged to be (now) wilfully, and contumaciously erring; and *Schismaticks*, such as depart, on what cause soever, from her Communion; as vindicating to her self (compounded, in her supreme *representative*, of all those particular Churches, that remain undivided from S. *Peters* Chair) the true Title, and right of the Catholick Church.

§. 74. Again; upon the same grounds, and as authorized immediately by our Lord, we find her holding her self obliged, and taking upon her, to give, and promulgate her Laws, in matters clearly *Spiritual*, and *Divine*, (secular powers, whether favouring, or frowning), to all her Subjects, however dispersed in several temporal Dominions; presuming still (and thinking, great reason for it) to use as much *spiritual* authority in their States, when Princes a e become Christian and her *Sons*, as all grant her lawfully to have done, when they were yet heathen, and her *Enemies*. We find her also pressing this obedience to her Decrees on her Children, not * from promising (as S. *Austin* || saith, the Manichees anciently did: which was the occasion of his writing his book *De utilitate Credendi* [*Ecclesiæ*] before that the things, we believe, are proved to us,) evident proofs, or demonstrations (though these are not wanting), but * from her *authority*, and commission received from our Lord, to decide all controversies, she thinks, necessary; and * from the *traditive* sence of holy Scripture delivered to her from her Fore-fathers. And so also it is,

|| De utilit. Credendi, c. 1.

in this Church; that her subjects, as soon as any thing is cleared to them to be the *Church*'s doctrine, dispute it no farther, but presently resign their judgement thereto.

§. 75. n. 1. And, as we find it publishing with great authority its Laws to all its Subjects, and Members, where ever residing: So also, by our Lords order (*Mat* 28. 19.); diligently sending forth its *Missions* into all quarters of the world, amongst strangers, and those out of its fold, whether *Infidels* or *Hereticks*, for converting, or reducing them to the Christian, and *Catholick* Faith. And to *this* Body, and that since the time of *Gregory* the First, (when also it was much-what the same, as it is now) do most of the Northern Nations owe their Conversion to Christianity; and at that time our Ancestors, among the rest, under *Ethelbert*, and his Successors, received that *Roman* Profession of Religion, which (900. years after) under *Edward* the Sixth, they cast off. And by the same indefatigable Zeal, Labours, and Sufferings of its *Missioners*, are still those great conversions of Mahometans, and Heathens made both in the *West*, and *East-Indies*, and Southern parts of *Affrick*: (not to insist here on the late reduction of some of the *Christian Sects* also of the Northern and Eastern parts to the Roman Communion.) ⌐'Where, in calling to mind Gods gracious promises, *of the Gospel to be preached to all Nations* ‖; and, *the fulness of the Gentiles*, to be brought into his Fold † (which we see both heretofore, and at the present, to be effected solely, or principally by this Body, through great hazards, and much expence of its blood), I desire all sober persons to consider; whether the good God, having thus promised to the Nations *Bread*, * would give them, instead thereof, but a *Stone*? and having promised them the *Revelation* of his Truth; yet * would not send it to them, but abased, and mixed with a manifold *Idolatry* (as Protestants imagine); the worshiping of *dead* men, and of a *breaden* God; and these brought in amongst them by *Antichrist* himself (if the Head of these *Missioners*, the Pope, be so); thus only Satan fighting against Satan; and Popery against Heathenism; * would not, I say, communicate unto them these waters of life to drink of, unless mortified, as it were 1st. with several errors, (as the Protestants say), *gross*, *damnable*, and perilous to their Salvation, and from which the external Communion of all true Believers ought to separate. And again, the end of the world, and, (as the Protestants say), of the reign of Antichrist (whom they count now above 1000. years old, his full age being foretold to be 1260.) being now not far off; I desire him (next) to consider; * whether that, which is said to be, in-

‖ Mat. 24. 14. Mark. 13. 10.
† Rom. 11.

'instead of the Roman, the most pure, and Orthodox Religion, '(recovered by *Luther*), and to which therfore these *Nations*, (if 'not already) must be at last converted; whether it, I say, now 'after a 150 years continuance, hath made any progress suitable to 'such an effect, as is the reducing of all *Nations* to its *Profession*; 'or rather, whether, after it had made a sudden increase at 1st. (as 'new things take most; and infancy grows fastest), it doth not 'seem already long ago to be past its full growth, and now rather 'declining, and withering, and loosing ground in many places, 'where it was formerly well rooted; whilst that *Antichrist* which it 'promiseth to destroy, acquires more strength and daily enlargeth 'his Dominions; to which I may add * whether, since protestancy 'is divided into so many Sects, severed under so many, differing, 'secular Heads, the *Nations* at length converted by them, if they 'should be brought by some to the *purity*, yet would not still in ge-'neral want the *Unity*, of the *Christian Faith*. But to return.']

All this authority we find one *present Body* using now, as the *Catholick Church* did anciently: and, among other things, this Body also entitling it self the *present Catholick Church*. So that if there be a Catholick Church still, which stands invested with that authority, that our Lord bestowed on it; and which the former Church practised; then, seeing that all other Christian societies do renounce and not pretend at all to such an authority; [*I mean, the requiring from their Subjects an assent and submission of judgment to their decrees, as infallible in all necessary faith; declaring Hereticks those that oppose their Doctrines, and Schismaticks, that relinquish their Communion*], and question this other Church also for using it; it follows, that either this must be the sole Church-Catholick that thus bears witness to it self, that it is so; or, that what ever Church besides pretends it self Catholick, doth not exercise, or own, that just power, and those priviledges, with which our Lord hath endowed it.

We find further this *present* Church very vigilant, and zealous in vindicating the honour, and authority, the customs, the decrees of *former* Church; and pretending (what ever in truth it doth) most strictly to follow its footsteps; extolling the *Fathers*; numbring, allowing, and challenging the *Councils*, as if it thought them most advantagious on its side; and carrying its self to this *old Mother* with such expressions of affection, as if it only were her true daughter. Therefore conjoyning the *tradition* of former Church interpreting Scripture, together with the *Text* thereof, for the steady guide of its proceedings, in establishing truth, and convincing Heresies: And professing to handle things con-

troverted, ‖ *Secundum ſacram Scripturam, Apoſtolorum traditiones, probata Concilia, Eccleſiæ Catholicæ conſenſum, & ſanctorum Patrum authoritates* We find it with the ſame Zeal, celebrating an honourable Memory of the Fathers, ancient Martyrs, Confeſſors, and Doctors in its publick Liturgies; inferting, therein, both their Traditionary Comments on the Text of Scripture, and an abridgement of their holy Lives; there praiſing God, for their pious Examples, and provoking her preſent children to an emulation of their vertues, (whilſt another Party, in its pretending a Reformation to the Doctrine and Manners of the Primitive Church; yet in its new Service, expunged both the Lections taken out of theſe Fathers, and the Narrative of their Lives.)

‖ Concil. Trident Seſſ. 18. Salv. Conduct.

We find it * retaining the ſame pnblick ſervice of the *Maſs*, with the Catholick Church of former ages (as its adverſaries confeſs‖) for this 1000. years (*i. e.* from the times of S. *Gregory*), if not without ſome ſmall additions of ſomething new, yet without change of what was the former: And * much reſembling the viſage of the ancient Church (eſpecially that after *Conſtantine*, when by the more copious Writings, of thoſe flouriſhing times, we come better to diſcern that Churches complexion) in its *Altars*, and a quotidian *Sacrifice*, in its frequency of publick, Aſſemblies and Devotions: Solemn obſervance of Feaſts, Vigils, and Faſts: Gravity, and Magnificence of its Ceremonies: In its pretention of Miracles, and extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Spirit, in ſeveral of its Members: in its high Veneration of the Celeſtial Favourites, who ſtand in the preſence of God, and daily Communication, by Commemorating the Saints departed, with the Church triumphant; and in the honour done to their Holy Relicks; in its charitable Offices performed for thoſe other more imperfect faithful Souls, whoſe condition in the next world it conceives betterable by its prayers and oblations: In its diſtinction of ſins, and uſe of its keys toward greater offenders: In retirements from the world, for a nearer converſe with God, and the freer exerciſe of Meditation and Devotion: In its variety of Religious Orders, Votaries, and Fraternities: In its advancing the obſervance of the Evangelical Councils; its high eſteem * of voluntary poverty, (*i. e.* relinquiſhing all particular propriety, and enjoying only neceſſaries in Common); * of virginity and continency; and * of yeilding an undiſputing obedience (*in licitis*) to all the Laws and commands of a Superiour: In the ſingle lives, and ſequeſtration from worldly incombrances, of its Clergy; obliged to a daily task of long Devotions, and purity

‖ Dr. *Field*, p. 188.--- Chemnit. Exam. Conc. Trid. Part. 2. de Canone *Miſſæ*.

of

of conscience, and corporal abstinence, suitable to their attendance on the Altar, and there daily, or very frequently, offering the Commemorative Sacrifice of our Lords all satisfactory Passion, and comunicating his most precious Body and Blood: In the like *relations*, with those of all past ages, concerning the eminent vertue shining in, and divine favours bestowed on, those holy persons, who have lived in its Communion; their great austerities and mortifications, Exstasies, Visions, Predictions, Miracles, *&c.*

['Which stories, if they be all supposed *lies*, and *fictions*, and *hypocrisies*, (all I say, or most of them, for that some counterfeits will 'mingle themselves among truth, there is no question), yet such '*lyes* are also found in all ages, even from the Apostolical Times; 'nor is the present age more guilty of them, than the precedent '(as may be seen by comparing the Stories related by S. *Austin* ||, 'the Saints lives written by S. *Jerome*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Theodoret*, '*Severus*, *Paulinus*, *Palladius*, *Gregory* the Great, *Gregory* of *Tours*, '*Bede*, *Bonaventure*, *Bernard*, and other ancient Authors, with the 'modern); whilst all other Religions, meanwhile, have such a 'disparity to antiquity, that in them no such things are, at least, 'fained. But indeed, did not many of these Stories con-'tain a certain truth, it cannot be imagined, that so many per-'sons reputed of great Sanctity and Devotion, and several of them 'contemporary to those, whose lives they recorded, should 'have written them with so full a testimony to many things, 'not as heard of others, but seen by themselves.] Of the Roman Church, and its adherents, So persevering in the steps of Antiquity thus *Grotius*, in the Preface to his *Votum pro Pace*, giving account there of his studies, in reading the Fathers.--- *Collegi* (saith he) *quæ essent illa, quæ veterum testimonio & manentibus in hunc diem vestigiis, semper & ubiq; & perseveranter essent tradita: Videbam ea manere in illâ Ecclesiâ, quæ Romanæ connectitur.*

|| De Civ. Dei, l. 22. c. 8.

Lastly, we find it a Body generally professing against any *Reformation* of the *Doctrines* of the former Church-Catholick, of any age whatsoever; and claiming no priviledge of *Infallibility* to it self for the present, which it allows not also to the Church, in all former times. This is the general Character of one *Combination* of the Churches in present being.

§. 76. *The Face of the present Protestant Churches.*

The other present *Combination* of *Churches* in the *Western* World, we find to be a Body of much different Constitution and Complection. * Much of its *Doctrin*, *Publick Service*, and *Discipline* confessed varying from the times immediately preceding

ing: It consisting of those who acknowledg themselves, or their Ancestors, once members of the former, and that have (as they say, upon an *unjust submission* required of them, yet this no more, than their forefathers paid) departed from it; * This new *Church* only *one person* at the first; afterward growing to a number; and protected against the *Spiritual*, by a *secular*, power: and so we find it subsisting, and acting, at this day, under many several *Secular Heads*, Independent of one another; without whose consent, and approbation first obtained (what if such head should be an Heretick?) *It* stands obliged, not at any time to make, or promulgate, and enforce upon its *Subjects*, any definitions, or decrees whatever in Spiritual matters. ‖ As to its *Ecclesiastical Governours*; we find it taking away the higher subordinations therein, that were formerly; and affirming an *Independent* Coordination, (as to incurring guilt of *Schism*,) some of all *Primates*; others, of all *Bishops*; very prejudical to the *Unity* of Faith. We find it standing also disunited from St. *Peters* Chair: yet this a much smaller Body still, than that which is joyned thereto: and therefore in a *General Council*, (supposing all the members thereof to continue in, and to deliver there, their present judgments touching points in dispute) such, as must needs be out-*voted* by the other: and hence, by the *Laws* of Councills, in duty obliged to submit, and conform to it. Neither seems there any relief to this party, to be expected from the accession to their side of any votes from the Churches more remote (*I* mean the *Greek*, or other *Eastern Churches*) if we will suppose these also to persist in their present judgment; whose Doctrine, in the chief controversies, is shewed ‖ to conspire (yet without any late confederacy) with that of this greater Body, which these reformed Churches have deserted.

‖ See 25. Henr. 8. *c.* 19.

‖ §. 158. &c.

§. 77. We find also this new Combination of Churches, in stead of pretending to assume to it self (Whatsoever *de facto* it doth, of which see more in the following *Chap.* §. 83. &c.) in its *Synods* the same authority in stating matters of Faith, which the ancient Councills have used, [1.] zealously contending, that Councills are *fallible* in their determinations (for so it supports the priviledg of using its own *judgment* against superiour Synods); [2.] and, accordingly, teaching its Subjects, that it self also is *fallible* in what it proposeth; [3] and engaging them (that they may not be deceaved by its authority) upon triall of its Doctrines, and search of the Truth, and examining, with the judgment of discretion, every one for him self, and then relying finally on that sentence, which their own reason gives: [4.] allowing also their dissent

sent to what it teacheth, till it proves to them its Doctrine out of the *Scripture*; or at least, whenever they are perswaded, that themselves, from thence, can evidence the contrary. Therefore it is also more sparing (or pretends to be so, of which see more below §. 85. &c.) in the *articles* of its faith, and *Religion*; especially *positive*; many of its Divines holding an union of *Faith* requisite only in some necessaries; and then contracting necessaries again in a narrower compass than the Creeds; and because it allows of no judge sufficient to clear what is to be held in controversies ‖, therefore holding most controversies in Religion not necessary at all to be determined: and much recommending an Union of *Charity* there, where cannot be had an *Union* of *Belief*.

‖ See 2. Disc. §. 38.

We find them also restraining *Heresy* to points fundamental; and then leaving fundamentals uncertain, and varying, as to several persons; fewer points fundamental to some, more to others; and this no way knowable by the Church. Again, making *Schism* only such a departure from the Church as is *causeless*; and then this thing, *when causeless*, to be judged (for any thing that appears) by those, who depart; by such notions, leaving *Heretick*s, and *Schismatick*s undiscernable by the Catholick Church, and unseparable from it; and therefore many seeming to understand the *One, Holy, Catholick, Apostolick* Church in the Creed, to signifie nothing else, than the totall *complex* of all Churches whatever professing Christianity; unless those persons be shut out, who, by imposing some restraint of opinion for enjoying their Communion, are said to give just cause of a separation.

Accordingly, we find this Body spreading its lap wide to several *Sects* (by which it acquires the more considerable magnitude;) and receiving, or *tolerating* in its communion many opposite parties of very different Principles; and hence, as it grows elder, so daily branching more and more into diversity of Opinions, and multiplying into more and more subdivisions of Sects; being destitute of any cure thereof, both by its necessary indulgement of that called *Christian liberty*, and allowance of *private judgment*; and also, by the absolute *Independency*, one on another, of so many several supream Governours, both the *Secular* and the *Ecclesiastical*; who model and order, diversly, the several parts thereof: (As the other Church, in her growing elder, grows more and more particular in her Faith; and with new definitions, and Canons, fenceth it round about, according as new errors would break in upon it.)

Further, we find several amongst its Leaders much offended, §. 78. n. 1. that *Church-Tradition* should be brought in, together with Scripture,

ture, as an authentick witness, or Arbitrator, in trying Controversies. (See the Protestants Conditions proposed to the *Council* of *Trent* ‖; that the *Holy Scripture* might be Judge in the Council, and all humane authority excluded, or admitted with a condition: *Fundantes se in* S. *Scripturis*:) taking great pains, to * discover the *errors* of the *Fathers*, and their contradicting of one another; (See *Daille's vray usage de Peres*;) and * to shew several of the *works* imputed to them, and admitted by *R.* Catholicks *suppositious*, and *forged*; (See *Cooks*, and *Perkins*, and *Rivets* Censures.) Taking no less pains, to shew the non necessity of *Councils* in General; to number the many difficulties, how to be assured which of them are legal and obliging; what their Decrees, and what the sence of them; to discover the flaws & deficiencies in most of the former Councils, (defended by *R.* Catholicks) as to their calling, or their number, or freedom of Votes, &c. (scarce any latter Council remaining unaspersed,) so to disenable their authority from obliging the Church's subjects; & accordingly renouncing the authority of those, which have been held in the time of their Ancestors, save only of some of the 1st. contending also, corruptions and superstitions, and Antichristianism, to have entred into the Church in the very first times; but more especially, in the fourth and fifth ages, when the copious Writings of many Learned Prelates make more evidently appear the sence of the Church: yet, especially the latter Protestant-Writers, not unusually, in particular Controversies disputed, pleading, these *Fathers*, and *Antiquity* (the credit whereof in general is so much disparaged) to go on their side.

‖ *Soave* p. 642-344. 366.

§. 78. n. 2.

Lastly, It seems very much swerved from the pattern of Antiquity in most of those things, wherein the other Body hath been said to resemble it. Especially in these. *The high esteem, frequentation, various uses of the precious Sacrifice of the Altar, frequency of Church Devotions, solemn observance of Feasts and Fasts*; *The Honour and solemn Commemorations of Glorified Saints and Martyrs*; *and remembrance at Gods Altar, of the other Faithful deceased*; *the practice, and recommendation of the three Monastick Vowes, and other Councils of perfection*: *The distinction of sins, and painful Discipline of Penitents*: *and a soveraign and undependent Church-Authority* (I mean as to true, unquestionable, Spirituals.) Therefore also, (perhaps, that God might leave to Posterity as it were a standing mark, and fore-warning of the *novelty* of the Reformed Religion, and spirit;) we find the two first grand Leaders thereof, *Luther* and *Calvin* (as if they thought to add the more reputation to their

new

new discoveries of truth, by having no former certain Guides therein, after the Apostles) to have proceeded, at the first, much more unwarily, than some of their Successors have done, in slighting Councils, and undervaluing *Antiquity*, and freely confessing the ancient, as well as latter, times to be of a different judgment from them. Of which to give you a more clear evidence, I have collected several of their more free expressions, used in those dayes, which if a matter already well known to you, you may pass on to §.79.

§.78.n.3. [Thus then *Luther*, concerning the Fathers, in the conclusion of his Book *contra Regem Angliæ*----- 'Non ego quæ-'ro (saith he), *quid Ambrosius, Augustinus, Concilia, & usus se-'culorum dicunt*---*Miranda est stultitia Satanæ, quæ iis me impugnat,* 'quæ ipse impugno; *& perpetuo Principium petit*----*Pro libertate ego* 'pugno, *Rex pro captivitate pugnat*, [Captivitate, in submitting to 'the Fathers]. In assertione Articul---*Jam quanti errores in omni-'um Patrum Scriptis inventi sunt? Quoties sibiipsis pugnant? Quis* 'est, *qui non sæpius Scripturas torserit*: And (in the begining)--*Pri-'mos scire contestatosq; illos volo; me prorsus nullius, quantum libet* 'Sancti, *Patris authoritate cogi velle, nisi quatenus judicio divinæ* 'Scripturæ [i. e. of his own sence of it] *Fuerit probata; id, quod* 'scio *illos vehementer ægre laturos; dicuntq; non esse Scripturas sacras* 'proprio *Spiritu interpretandas* --- And --- *Cur non liceat hodie, aut* 'solum *aut primum, Sacris litteris studere, sicut licuit primitivæ Ecclesiæ:* '[as if nothing descended by Tradition]. In his pro-'testation before his Book *de Abrogatione Missæ* ---*Protestor imprimis* '(saith he) *adversus eos, qui insanis vocibus in me sunt clamaturi;* 'quod *contra ritum Ecclesiæ, contra statuta Patrum, contra probatas* 'legendas, *& receptissimum usum docuerim, horum nihil me auditu-'rum*---*Sciant indocti Pontifices, impii Sacerdotes, Sacrilegi Mona-'chi* &c, *nos non esse baptizatos, neq; credentes in nomine Augustini,* 'Bernardi, *Gregorii*, &c.-----*Non audimus; Bernardus sic vixit, &* 'scripsit; *sed Bernardus sic vivere, & scribere debuit juxta scripturas.* 'Concerning the Mass-----'*Ultimo dicta Patrum inducit rex pro Mis-'sario Sacrificio, & ridet meam stultitiam, quod solus velim sapere præ* 'omnibus. *Hoc est quod dixi; Thomisticos Asinos habere nihil, quod pro-'ducant, nisi multitudinem hominum, & usum antiquum.* And, *in Cap-'tivitate Babilonica*, he resolues--*Si nihil habetur quod dicatur* [i. e. in 'answer to the Fathers], *satius est omnia negasse, quam Missam Sa-'crificium esse, concedere.* And on the same matter, *in Missa privata* '---*Hic non moramur* (saith he) *si clamitent Papistæ, Ecclesia, Eccle-'sia, Patres, Patres; quia ut dixi hominum dicta, aut facta, nihil in tam* 'magnis causis *curamus; Scimus enim ipsos Prophetas lapsos esse, adeoq;*

'*Apostolos* &c. And the Fathers put together, *i. e.* the
‖Assertion *Art.* 'Councils, fare no better---- 'Ego doceo (saith he ‖) *Conciliis dis-*
'*sentire, & resistere, si quando contraria Scripturæ* [he must mean
'here, contrary to what he apprehends to be the sence of Scripture]
'*statuunt*. And in his Book *de Judicio Ecclesiæ de quavis doctrina*,
'he saith--- '*Christus admit Episcopis, Doctoribus, & Conciliis tum jus,*
'*tum potestatem judicandi de Doctrina, ac tradit illa omnibus Christia-*
'*nis in Genere*; quoting for it Jo. 10. 4. ——, *Oves meæ vocem meam*
'*audiunt, alienum autem non sequuntur, sed fugiunt* &c. and 1 Thes.
'5. *Omnia probates*. So, *contra Regem Angliæ*, On, --- '*Attendite a*
'*falsis Prophetis* Matt. 17. 15. ---- *Hæc sola authoritas* (saith he)
'*satis esse queat adversus omnium Pontificum, omnium Patrum, omnium*
'*Conciliorum, omnium Scholarum sententias, quæ jus judicandi, &*
'*discernendi solis Episcopis, & Ministris tribuerunt*, And, in the distracti-
'ons of the new Reformation, some motioning a Synod to be called
'amongst them, as necessary for setling them, he gives his grave
‖Tom. 2 p. 243. 'judgment of Synods thus ‖---- '*Quantumvis bono zelo tentata, est*
'*res mali Exempli; ut probant omnia Ecclesiæ concilia ab initio* [so far,
'as not to spare that of the Apostles, Act. 15.], *Ita ut & in Apostolico*
'*concilio ferme de operibus, & Traditionibus, magis quam de fide, sit*
'*tractatum; in posterioribus vero nunquam de fide, sed semper de opini-*
'*onibus, & quæstionibus disputatum; ut mihi conciliorum nomen pæne*
'*tam suspectum, & invisum sit, quam nomen* liberi Arbitii, Lastly,
'the 3*d*. Canon of the Council of Nice prohibiting the Clergy,
'*ne haberent secum* [in their house] *mulierem extraneam nisi forte sit*
‖De conciliis '*mater aut soror, aut avia aut avita aut matertera*; he saith ‖--- *Se*
'*non intelligere sanctum spiritum in hoc Concilio*.---And again--- *An*
'*vero nihil aliud est negotii spiritui sancto in conciliis, quam ut impossibi-*
'*libus, periculosis, non necessariis, legibus suos ministros obstringat, &*
'*oneret*. I beseech all sober Christians to consider, whether
'this seems a fit, and well seasoned vessel, for God to infuse into it
'those new Evangelical Truths, which had been hid to so many
'former generations; and whether he speaks like a true genuine
'Son of the ancient Church.

§. 78. n. 4. 'Neither, after him, will he find *Calvin* of any different
'temper, who pleaseth, for his satisfaction, to peruse those many
'places in his *Institutions*, wherein he so freely censures Antiquity.
‖*Iastit.* 4. l. 18. *c.* 11. §. 'There ‖ Concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass--- '*Quia veteres*
'*quoq; illos* (saith he) *video alio hanc memoriam* [*i. e. sacrificii in*
'*cruce peracti*] *detorcisse, quam institutioni Domini conveniebat* (*quod,*
'*nescio quam repetitæ, aut saltem renovatæ, immolationis faciem eo-*
'*rum cœna præ se ferebat*) [a thing objected still to the present, as,
'to the ancient Church,] *Nihil tutius piis pectoribus fuerit, quam*

in

'*in purâ, simpliciq; Dei ordinatione acquiescere*---Again---*Excusari* '[veteres] *non posse arbitror, quin aliquid in actionis modo peccaverint:* '*Imitati sunt enim propius Judaicum sacrificandi modum, quàm aut* '*ordinaverit Christus, aut Evangelii ratio ferebat*--- *In quâ merito e-* '*os quis redarguat, quod non contenti simplici & germanâ Christi in-* '*stitutione ad legis umbras nimis deflexerunt* [see much more in 'Beza, Epist.8.] About the manner of consecration of the Ele- 'ments, and the reposition or reservation of the Sacrament to be 'ready at any time for communicating the sick, (which, being re- 'served only in one kind, infers likewise ancient communicating 'the sick only in one kind).---*Sed enim* (saith he ‖) *qui sic faciunt,* ‖ L.4.c.17. §. 39. '*habent veteris Ecclesiæ Exemplum. Fateor. Verum in re tantâ, &* '*in quâ non sine magno periculo erratur, nihil tutius est, quàm ipsam* '*veritatem sequi.* Concerning prayer for the Dead. ‖ *At* ‖ L.3.c.5.§.10. '*vetustissima fuit Ecclesiæ observatio*--- *Cum mihi objiciunt adversarii* '*ante mille, & trecentos annos receptum fuisse: Eos rursus interrogo,* '*quo Dei verbo, quâ revelatione, quo exemplo, factum est?* Calling 'there S. *Monica*'s request to S. *Austin* ‖, to be remembred at the ‖ *Augustin,* 'Altar, *anile votum.* Concerning penances and satis- Confess. 9. c. 'factions, (the imposing a necessity of which penances, by anti- 11. 'quity, upon secret criminous Offenders, infers also a necessity,) 'to such Offenders, of Sacerdotal confession ‖ --- *Plus æquo certe* ‖ L.3. c.3. §. 'insistere in his mihi videntur* [*vetusti Scriptores*]--- And--- *In exi-* 16. '*gendis castigationibus fuerunt aliquanto rigidiores, quàm ferat Eccle-* '*siastica mansuetudo.*---And ‖--- *Quâ in parte excusari nullo modo po-* ‖ L.4.c12.§.8. '*test immodicà vederum austeritas, quæ & prorsus a Domini præ-* '*scripto dissidebat*, &c. ---And ‖--- *Parum me movent, quæ in vete-* ‖ L.3. c.4. §. '*rum scriptis de satisfactione passim occurrunt. Video quidem eorum* 38. '*non-nullos, dicam simpliciter, omnes fere, quorum libri exstant,* '*aut hac in parte lapsos esse, aut nimis aspere ac dure locutos.*

'Concerning Monastick vowes, and life ‖--- *Non dissimulo, vel* ‖ L.4. c.13. §. '*in illâ, quam Augustinus commendat, priscâ formâ esse nonnihil,* 16. '*quod parum mihi placeat* ---- *Christianæ mansuetudinis non est, quasi* '*odio humani Generis, in desertum & solitudinem confugere*--- *Exem-* '*plum inutile, & periculosum, in Ecclesiam induxit.* Con- 'cerning the vow of Continency, and Celibacy of the Clergy ‖ ‖ L.4. c.13. §. '--- *Fateor antiquitus quoq; receptum fuisse hunc morem; sed eam æ-* 17. '*tatem sic ab omni vitio liberam fuisse non concedo, ut pro regulâ haben-* '*dum sit, quicquid tunc factum est.*---And ‖---*Secuta sunt deinde tem-* ‖ L.4. c.12. §. '*pora* [i.e. post Nicænam Synodum], *quibus invaluit nimis super-* 27. '*stitiosa cælibatus admiratio*--- *Hinc illi Canones, quibus primo veti-* '*tum est, ne matrimonium contraherent, qui pervenissent ad Sacerdotii* '*gradum: deinde, ne in eum ordinem assumerentur nisi cælibes, aut*

'qui thoro conjugali, unà cum uxoribus, renunciarent. Con-
‖ L. 2. c. 2. §. 4. 'cerning free will ‖--- *Inter Scriptores Ecclesiasticos* [i. e. veteres]
'--- *multi longe plus æquo Philosophis accesserunt.* Con-
v. addend. 364. 'cerning authority of Councils ‖--- *Quoties alicujus Concilii de-*
‖ L. 4. c. 9. §. 8. 'cretum profertur---*velim illud ipsum de quo agitur ad Scripturæ*
'am ussim examinari.---And ‖---*Nulla conciliorum, Pastorum, Episcopo-*
‖ §. 12. 'rum nomina (*quæ tàm falso obtendi, quàm usurpari possunt*) *nos im-*
'pediant, *quo minus, & verborum, & rerum documentis moniti, omnes*
'*omnium spiritus, ad divini verbi regulam, exigamus* [i. e. ones own in-
‖ §. 8. 'terpretation of it]--- And ‖--- *In recentionibus Conciliis, dum nu-*
'*merantur, non appenduntur sententiæ, meliorem partam a majore*
'*vinci sæpius necesse fuit.* Much more might be added out of these
'two, the most famed, Reformers: And he that would look fur-
'ther, let him pass on to the Centurists, viewing their then free
'and candid Confessions, concerning the Lapses of the fourth
'age (*i. e.* the first, wherein Christian Religion flourished, and
'shewed her face more openly,) and so downward, as if they
'added so much more credit to the *Reformation*, by how much
'more ancient they shewed those errours, or corruptions, to have
'been, which it encountred and overthrew. But this, I have
'here set down, I think, is sufficient, that by the complexion,
'and temper of these two cheif Authors of the *Reformation*
'you may discern what blood runneth in the veins of their
'posterity, whatever Alliance to antiquity is professed: and
'may see, whether their followers in the same Doctrine, can
'any way justly own that antiquity for it, that these Predecessors
'disclaimed.]

§. 79. This appears to me much-what the face of the *two present* Churches: the *latter* of which, because I may be thought not to have drawn favourably enough, or yet some lines thereof, not according to truth, if they be applyed to some persons, that are more *moderate*, or Church, among them, that is of a *better constitution*: I desire none to give any credit to any part thereof further, than his own experience shall find it true: and to look upon what is said, as things proposed only to his search, not imposed on his credulity. After which search diligently made (as it much concerns him), let him again review, and compare, which of these two, in its constitution, and Oeconomy, hath more resemblance of that *Church* described in the New Testament; and acting in Primitive timess, (mentioned before, §. 67. 68.): and then, that of the two, which, by its greater likeness in Government, & manners to this ancient Church, he takes to be his *Catho-*

lick

lick Mother, let him ſecurely caſt himſelf into her arms, and communion: and inſtead of committing himſelf to his own underſtanding, and induſtry, to find out his own way to Heaven, (becauſe he can ſecurely truſt no living guide on Earth beſides), through all the thorny controverſies of the preſent age, grown (as Dr. *Field* ſaith) in number ſo many, and in matter ſo intricate; which require vaſt pains throughly to examine; and an excellent judgment aright to determine; and which much eloquence, and long ſmoothing of them, the interpoſing of humane reaſon in divine matters, and the varying records of former ages, have rendred on all ſides ſo far plauſible, and reſembling truth, that a little intereſt ſerves the turne to blind a man in his choice, and make him embrace an errour for truth; let him *I* ſay humbly reſigne his wearied, and diſtracted judgment wholly to her direction.

§. 80.

For (as Sir *Edwyn Sandys* in his *Relation* of the *Weſtern* Religions ‖ ſpeaks methinks very pertinently, though in the perſon of a *Romaniſt*, pleading his own cauſe) --*Seeing Chriſtianity is a Doctrine of Faith, a Doctrine, whereof all men even children, are capable, as being groſs and to be believed in general* [by all]: *Seeing the high vertue of Faith is in the humility of the underſtanding; and the merit thereof, in the readineſs of Obedience to embrace it: and ſeeing the outward proofs thereof are no other than probable, and of all probable proofs the Church-teſtimony is moſt probable* [So he: which I propoſe rather thus: Seeing of outward proofs of our Faith, where the true ſenſe of Scripture is the thing diſputed, the Church's teſtimony, (whether for declaring to us the ſenſe of Scripture, or judgment of the Ancients), is a proof of moſt weight]; *What madneſs were it for any man to tire out his ſoul, and to waſt away his ſpirits, in tracing out all the thorny paths of the controverſies of theſe days, wherein to err is no leſs eaſy, than dangerous, what through forgery* [of authors] *abuſing him what through ſophiſtry tranſporting him; and not rather to betake himſelf to the right path of truth, whereunto God, and nature, reaſon, and experience, do all give witneſs? and that is, to aſſociate himſelf to that* Church, *whereunto the cuſtody of this heavenly, and ſupernatural truth hath been, from heaven it ſelf, committed: to weigh diſcreetly which is the true* Church; *and, that being once found, to receive faithfully, and obediently, without doubt, or diſcuſſion, whatſoever it delivereth?*

‖ p. 29.

§. 81.

And then further: If, in this diſquiſition of his (to make uſe here of that plea, which the ſame Author, in the following words, hath very fairly drawn up ‖ for the Church of *Rome*, and her adherents, without giving us any counter-defence, or ſhewing any more powerful attractives of the Churches reformed; what ever

‖ Relation of Weſtern Religions p. 30.

ever he intended)---*If* [*besides the* Roman, *and those Churches united, with it*] *he finds all other Churches to have had their end, or decay long since,* [*I* mean the Sects, and Religions, that have been formerly in the Western World; *Hussites, Lollards, Waldenses, Albigenses, Berengarians,* which some Protestants make much pretence to], *or their beginning but of late: if This being founded by the Prince of the Apostles, with promise to him by Christ, that Hell gates should not prevaile against it, but that himself will be assistant to it till the Consummation of the World, hath continued on now till the end of a* 1600. *years, with an honourable and certain line of near* 240. *Popes Successors of* St. Peter; *both tyrants and traytors, pagans, and heretick, in vain wresting, raging, and undermining. If all the lawful* General Councils, *that ever were in the world, have from time to time approved, and honoured it; if God hath so miraculously blessed it from above, as that so many sage* Doctors *should enrich it with their writings; such armies of Saints with their holiness, of Martyrs with their Blood; of Virgins with their purity; should sanctifie and embellish it: If even at this day, in such difficulties of unjust rebellions, and unnatural revolts of her neerest children, yet she stretcheth out her arms to the utmost corners of the world, newly embracing whole Nations into her bosome. If Lastly, in all other opposite Churches, there be found inward dissentions, and contrariety, change of opinions, uncertainty of resolutions, with robbing of Churches, rebelling against governours* [things much more experienced since this authors death in the late *Presbiterian* wars] *confusion of order* [invading of Episcopacy, yea and Presbytery too] *whereas contrariwise, in this Church, the unity undivided the resolutions unalterable, the most heavenly order reaching from the height of all power to the lowest of all subjection, all with admirable harmony, and undefective correspondence, bending the same way to the effecting of the same work, do promise no other than continual increase, and victory; let no man doubt to submit himself to this glorious spouse of God &c. This then being accorded to be the true Church of God, it follows, that she be reverently obeyed in all things without further inquisition; she having the warrant, that he that heareth her, heareth Christ; and whosoever heareth her not, hath no better place with God, than a publican, or a pagan. And what folly were it to receive the Scriptures upon credit of her authority* [the authority of the Church, that was before *Luthers* time]; *and not to receive the interpretation of them upon her authority also and credit? And if God should not alway protect his Church from errour* [*i. e.* dangerous to, or distructive of, Salvation] *and yet peremptorily commanded men always to obey her: then had he made but very slender provision for the salvation of Mankind; which conceit concerning* God (*whose care of us even in all things touching this* transitory *life, is so plain, and eminent*)

eminent), *were ungrateful, and impious. And hard were the case, and mean had his regard been, of the* vulgar people, *whose wants, and difficulties in this life will not permit, whose capacity will not suffice, to sound the deep, and hidden mysteries of Divinity, and to search out the truth of intricate controversies, if there were not others, whose authority they might* [safely] *rely on. Blessed are they, who believe, and have not seen,* [Though they do not see reason always for that they believe, have only that reason of their Belief drawn from authority]; *the merit of whose Religious humility, and obedience, doth exceed perhaps, in honour, and acceptation before God, the subtil, and profound knowledge of many others.* Thus that Author pleads the cause of the Roman, and its adherent, Churches, without a Reply.——

To which perhaps it will not be amiss to joyn the like Plea, for this Church, drawn up by another eminent person ‖ in a treatise writ concerning the unreasonableness of prescribing to other mens Faith; wherein he indeavoured to represent several Sects of Christianity in their fairest colours, in order to a charitable toleration. These considerations then he there proposeth concerning the Roman Church (*Which* (saith he) *may very easily perswade persons of much reason, and more piety, to retain that, which they know to have been the Religion of their Fore-fathers; which had actual possession, and seizure of mens understandings, before the oppposite profession had a name*). *These are, first, Its Doctrine's having had a long continuance, and possession of the Church; which therefore cannot easily be supposed, in the present Professors, to be a design,* [for covetous, ambitious, and other, unlawful ends, of which yet Protestants frequently accuse them] *since they have received it from so many ages; and it is not likely, that all ages should have the same purposes, or that the same doctrine should serve the several ends of diverse ages. Its long prescription, which is such a prejudice, as cannot with many arguments be retrench'd; as relying upon these grounds; that truth is more ancient than falshood; that God would not, for so many ages, forsake his Church, and leave her in an error* [I add, not in such gross errors as are imputed; especially, not in Idolatry, so manifold; in respect of the Eucharist; of the Cross; of Angels and Saints; of Relicks; of Images, &c.] Again; *The beauty, and splendour of that Church; their pompous service* [in a friendlier expression, their service, full of religious Ceremony, and external Veneration]. *The stateliness and solemnity of the Hierarchy; their name of* Catholick, *which they suppose,* [and claim, as] *their own due, and to concern no other Sect of Christians. The Antiquity*

§. 82. n. 1.

‖ Dr. *Taylor* liberty of prophecying, §. 20. p. 249.

of

of many of their Doctrines; the continual succession of their Bishops; their immediate derivation from the Apostles; their title to succeed St. Peter [and in this regard, chiefly honoured, and submitted to by Antiquity]: *the supposal, and pretence of his personal prerogatives* [much spoken of by the Fathers] *the flattering expressions of minor Bishops* [in modester language, the honourable expressions concerning this Church from many eminent Bishops of other inferior Sees] *which, by being old Records, have obtained Credibility. The multitude, and variety of people, which are of their perswasion; apparent consent with some elder Ages, in many matters doctrinal; the advantage which is derived to them by entertaining some personal opiniens of Fathers, which they with infinite clamours cry up to be a doctrine of the Church of that time*; [or trulier thus: entertaining the Doctrine of the Church of the ancient times, which Protestants cry down as only the personal opinions of the Fathers]. *The great consent of one part with another, in that which most of them affirm to be* de fide; *the great differences which are commenced among their adversaries, abusing the liberty of prophecying, unto a very great licentiousness, their happiness of being instruments in converting diverse Nations; the advantage of Monarchical Goverment, the benefit of which they daily do enjoy; the piety, and the austerity of their Religious Orders of men, and women; the single life of their Priests, and Bishops; the Riches of their Church; the severity of their fasts, and their exteriour observances; the great Reputation of their Bishops for Faith, and Sanctity; the known holiness of some of those persons, whose Institutes the Religious persons pretend to imitate; their* Miracles, *false, or true, substantial, or imaginary* [or trulier, several of which (though none affirms all, or perhaps the most of those pretended) are confirmed by such clear Testimonies, as if any Faith may be had to any humane Testimony, or to any History, they cannot be false, or imaginary,]. *The casualties, and accidents, that have hapned to their adversaries; the obliq; acts, and indirect proceedings of some of those, who departed from them; and, among many other things, the names of* Heretick, *and* Schismatick; *which they, with infinit pertinacy, fasten upon all, that disagree from them*: [or trulier, which this Church, with a venerable, and paternal authority, and correction, (as the Catholick Church in all ages hath done, and none other Church in this age, except this, presumeth to do) pronounceth on all others, who depart from her Faith, or Communion: as also, in former ages, the same names have been fastned on all those, who have so departed, On *Berengarius, Wicliff, Waldenenses*, &c.]

These Persuasives Dr. *Taylor* hath there collected, *As inducing*

lucing persons of much reason, and more piety, to retain the Religion of their Fore-fathers: Now let any, if they can, gather out of him, he counter-perswasives, that over-poise these, and may induce ersons *of much reason*, and *equal piety*, to renounce the Religion of their *Fore-fathers*, and, harkning to some Negative Arguments rom Scripture, or, for some points, perhaps also from the Writers of the three first ages, commit themselves to the conduct of the new Reformers; at the first, a few; of the lowest ranck of Clergy; lying under the Ecclesiastical censures; assisted, against their spiritual Superiours, by some secular powers; when both they, and these were Subjects, as to the judgement of all *Spiritual* matters, to that *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* which they opposed.

§. 82. n. 2.

Now to confirm what hath been said above; In the last place, I will set you down some passages of S. *Austine*, representing the Catholick Church 1. as an united, and distinct Body; 2. easily discernable from Sects; 3. and where Scriptures are controverted, to be obeyed and adhered to; 4. though this, not always for any other present reason, or proof given us of what she holds, save only that of her *Authority*; which passages of this, the most eminent Father of the Church, I also seriously commend to his Meditation, who is in an humble quest after this Guide.

1st. Concerning the Catholick Church: That it, where any *division* is made from *Superiours* (as was made by the *Donatists* from a *General Council*) is only one of these Churches, and not both; St. *Austine* ‖ mentions this proposition as agreed on, both by the Donatists, and Catholicks.— *Unam oportet esse Ecclesiam* †— and— *Una est Ecclesia quæcunq; illa sit, de quâ dictum est* ‖— *Una est columba mea, una est matri suæ; nec possunt tot esse Ecclesiæ, quot Schismata.* ‖— And so he allows the Donatists arguing; — *Si nostra est Ecclesia Christi, non est Ecclesia Christi vestra Communio.* This Tenent of theirs he passeth for truth; and only opposeth this other; that theirs, and not that from which they separated, was it; and there proveth the contrary, *viz.* That the Anti-Donatist was that, *una Ecclesia, quæ sola Catholica nominatur*; and that the Donatist was *Communio a suâ unitate separata.* ‖

‖ De Baptismo l. 1. c. 10.
† Cap. 10.
‖ Cantic. 6. c.
‖ De Baptismo l. 1. c. 11.
‖ Ib. Cap 10.

§. 82. n. 3.

2. Again: Concerning this *one Catholick* Church, that it is easie to be known, and discerned from others, he saith in his book *De unitate* Ecccleſiæ against the same Donatists ‖— *Non est obscura quæstio, in quâ vos fallunt, quos ipse Dominus prædixit futuros atq; dicturos: Ecce hic est Christus, ecce illic, ecce in deserto, quasi ubi*

‖ Cap. 20.

non est frequentia multitudinis; ecce in cubiculis, quasi in secretis traditionibus, atq; doctrinis. Habetis Ecclesiam ubiq; diffundi, & crescere usq; ad messem; Habetis Civitatem, de quâ ipse, qui eam condidit, ait; non potest Civitas abscondi super montem posita. Ipsa est ergo, quæ non in aliquâ parte terrarum, sed ubiq; notissima est. And — *Contra Cresconium, l. 1. c. 33.* He iterates the same — *Si autem dubitas, quod Ecclesiam, quæ per omnes gentes numero sitate copiosissimâ dilatatur, hæc S. Scriptura commendat, multis & manifestissimis testimoniis ex eâdem authoritate* [the Scriptures] *prolatis onerabo.* [where he that will say, this *Father* speaks of the *Church Catholick*, only as it was in *his*, not as it is to be in *all*, times; must also interpret those *Scriptures*, from which he proves it, to speak of *his*, or some times only, not of *all*; which is absurd, and would have voided S. *Austine*'s arguing, used against the Donatists then, (as well as any others, now:) who might have replyed to him; that these *Texts* were verified of *some*, but not of *their*, times. And indeed they did urge, that S. *Austine's* sence of them, in application to the Church, failed in the *Arrian* times; and upon this See (in his 48 *Epistle*) his vindicating them to be verified of it in all times. And it seems all reason, that, in the Scripture's describing that Church, to whose bosome and Communion all people were, for ever, to resort, the marks, to know it by, should be Universal; and no more demonstrate to Christians the Church of one age, than of another; no more that in S. *Austines* times, than that in *ours*; to whose Faith and Communion, Christians have in *all* times, a like duty to conform; and whose judgement, a like necessity, to consult. Though it is willingly granted, that such Properties admit of several degrees; nor is it necessary either for its *multitude*, *extent*, or *eminency*, that the Church should alway enjoy them in an equal proportion.

§. 82. n. 4.

3ly. Concerning our duty of crediting, and adhering to the *Church*'s testimony, and judgement in matters controverted, and obscure, he thus discourseth ‖ against the Donatists; who pleaded, nothing in *Scriptures* could be shewed clear against them. — *Proinde, quamvis hujus rei certe de Scripturis Canonicis non proferatur exemplum, earundem tamen Scripturarum, etiam in hac re, a nobis tenetur veritas, cum hoc facimus, quod universæ placuit Ecclesiæ, quam ipsarum Scripturarum commendat authoritas; ut, quoniam Sancta Scriptura fallere non potest, quisquis falli metuit, hujus obscuritate quæstionis, eandem Ecclesiam de illâ consulat, quam sine ullâ ambiguitate Sancta Scriptura demonstrat.* Again: *De Unitate Ecclesiæ, c. 19.* — *Hoc* (saith he) *aperte, atq; evidenter* [(i.e.) in the Scripture] *nec ego lego, nec tu,* — *Nunc vero, cum in Scri-*

‖ Contra Cresconium, l. 1. c. 33.

Scripturis non inveniamus &c, puto, si aliquis sapiens extitisset, cui Dominus Jesus Christus testimonium perhibet [that we should be directed by his judgment], *Et de hac quæstione consuleretur a nobis, nullo modo dubitare deberemus id facere, quod ille dixisset; ne non tam ipsi, quam Domino Jesu Christo, cujus testimonio condemnatur, repugnare judicaremur: Perhibet autem testimonium Christus Ecclesiæ suæ.*

4. Lastly, Concerning the benefit in adhering to, and relying on the *Church's authority*, or testimony, before that proved to us, which yet she delivers to us; he discourseth thus, in his Book *De utilitate Crerendi* [i.e. *credendi Ecclesiæ* ‖], written, not long after his Conversion, to a former acquaintance --- '*qui irridebat* (as he saith ‖) *Catholicæ fidei disciplinam, qua juberentur* credere *homines; non autem, quid esset verum*, certissima ratione *docerentur*-- *Recte* (saith he) *Catholicæ disciplinæ majestate institutum est, ut accedentibus ad Religionem fides* [i.e. adhibenda anthoritati ecclesiæ] *persuadiatur ante omnia*--and, c. 10.--*Sed, inquis, nonne erat melius, rationem mihi reddere, ut, quocunq; ea me duceret, sine ulla sequerer temeritate, ? Erat fortasse, sed cum res tantasit, ut Deus tibi ratione cognoscendus sit, omnes ne putas idoneos esse percipiendis rationibus, quibus, ad divinam intelligentiam, mens ducitur humana? an plures, an paucos, ais, existimo. Quid? ~~Paucos~~ cæteris ergo hominibus, qui ingenio tam sereno præditi non sunt, negandam* Religionem *putas?* [If not; such must receive this their Religion not from Reason, but authority.] And, c. 16.--*Authoritate decipi miserum est; miserius non moveri. Si Dei providentia non præsidet rebus humanis, nihil est de Religione satagendum--- Non est desperandum, ab eodem ipso Deo authoritatem aliquam constitutam, qua, velut gradu incerto, innitentes, attollamur in Deum--Hæc autem authoritas, seposita ratione (qua sincerâ intelligere, ut diximo, difficilimum stultis est) dupliciter nos movet, partim miraculis partim sequentium multitudine*--And c. 8. He thus exhorts his sceptical Friend *Honoratus* seduced by the *Manicheans*---*Si jam satis jactatus videris, sequere viam Catholicæ Disciplinæ, quæ ab ipso Christo per Apostolos ad nos usq; manavit, & abhinc ad posteros manatura est.* Those, who can humble their reason so far, as to embrace this holy Counsil, through the abundant providence of God, will find no great difficulty in discerning their right *Guides*, and chusing the true *Religion*.

§. 82. n. 5.

‖ cap. 13.

‖ *Retract.* 1. 1. c. 14.

paucos?

CHAP. VII.

Whether the Church of England *doth not require assent to her Articles of Religion. Several Canons in her Synods seeming to require it.* §. 83. n. 1. *The complaint of the* Presbyterians, *concerning it.* §. 83. n. 4. *The Doctrine of her Divines.* §. 84. n. 1. *Where, concerning the just importance of Negative Articles.* §. 84. n. 1.----*and* 85. n. 2. *and concerning conditional assent.* §. 84. n. 4.----*and* 85. n. 10. *That to some of the* 39 *Articles assent is due, and ought to be required.* §. 85. n. 1. *That the Roman Church doth not require assent to all the Canons of her Councills, as to points* Fundamental; i. e. *of any of which a* Christian *nescient cannot be saved.* §. 85. n. 4. *That obedience either of* assent *or* non-contradiction, *if required by the* Church *of* England *to all the* 39. Articles, *seems contrary to the Laws of the* Church; *and to the* Protestant Principles. §. 85. n. 11.

§.83.n.1. AFter this view of the 2. present opposit *Churches*, which of them more resembles the ancient *Catholick*; the latter whereof, the *Protestant* Churches, seem to build the defence of the *Reformation*, and the Vindication of their liberty from former *Church-laws*, upon the denial of any such obedience *of assent*, or *belief* due thereto, as was exacted by the former Church, and her Councils; (of which matter see what is said before §. 39. &c.).

‖ §.66. I think fit, before I proceed to the 2d. thing proposed ‖ [the answering the many difficulties and objections urged against any *Infallible Church Authority*] to search here, first, more particularly: whether this liberty which *Protestants* claime in respect of an authority *superiour*, the Councils, and former Church; yet be not denyed by them to their *Subjects*; at least by the Church of *England*; if we may informe our selves out of the most obvious sence of several of those Canons, made in the late National *Synods* thereof.

1. That (then) the National *Synods* of the Church of *England*, (notwithstanding their heavy accusations of the Council of *Trent* for the like practices) do exact the Obedience of Assent to their Decrees; and that under pain of Excommunication, or of such persons being cut off from the Unity of the Church (and so, if the Excommunication

nication be just, of such person if impenitent being cut off from the Body of Christ, and taken, of the whole multitude of the Faithful, as an *Heathen* and *Publican* ||), See 1st. the *Synod* held under K. *James* 1603. the 4th. Canon whereof runs thus *Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the forme of Gods Worship established by Law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer containeth any thing in it, that is repugnant to the Scriptures, let him be Excommunicated* ipso facto, *and not restored, but after his Repentance, and publick Revocation of such his wicked* Errors.-----

|| *Art. of Church of* England 33.

Again, thus Can. 5. ——*Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that any of the* 39. *Articles agreed upon by the whole* Clergy *in the Convocation held* 1562. *for the avoiding diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent, touching true Religion, are in any part erroneous, or such, as he may not with a good Conscience subscribe unto, let him be Excommunicated* ipso facto, *and not restored, but after his Repentance, and publick revocation of such his wicked errours.*

To which may be added * the title Prefixed to the 39 Articles, which saith; *that these Articles were drawn up for the avoiding diversities of opinions, & for the establishing of consent touching true Religion.* And * those words, in the *Preface* to the same Articles, *Requiring all the Subjects of this* Church *to continue in the uniforme profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said* Articles.

Here then 1st. the Church of *England*, in the Title, and in the 5th Canon, declares, that these Articles were drawn up for the avoiding of *diversities* of *opinions*, and for the *establishing of Consent*. But, how doth the drawing-up, or also the imposing, of these Articles, effect the avoiding diversities of opinions, if the Church by this act layes no restraint at all upon *opinions*, nor the Subscription required to them, imply any *assent* to, or belief of them? or, how effect the establishing of consent, if all the obedience the Church requires to them be only a *non-contradiction*?

2. Again; here (in the preface to the Articles) not only silence, and non-renouncing, but *professing*, of them is required; but none are tied to profess any thing, but what they also are tied either to believe; or to profess, though against their Conscience. 3. Again: In the 5th Canon, the words---*Erroneous, or such, as he may not with a good Conscience subscribe*; do imply, that he cannot with a good Conscience subscribe to them, who thinks them erroneous; but any may subscribe to them with a good conscience, though they be erroneous, if the subscription only oblige to *non-contradiction*; for none are bound *in conscience* to contradict every thing, that they hold an errour 4ly. Here (in the 4th. and 5th. Canon) the Church of *England* Excommunicates them, that affirme such

such, and such things, not, till they repent of, and publickly revoke their unpeaceful, or turbulent *contradiction* of her decree, but till they repent of, and revoke their *wicked errours*: and see *Can* 12 revoke their *Anabaptistical errours*; where [*Annabaptisticall* joyned to Errour clearly applies the word [Errour] not to the act of contradicting, but to the matter, wherein such a one contradicts. Now Excommunication here, till one revokes his Errours, is till one changeth, or at least professeth, that he changeth his opinion; for one may revoke, or Repent of his *Contradiction*, who doth not at all of his *Errours*; which contradiction is not an Errour of the understanding, but a fault of manners; which also we easily rectifie, without repenting of or revoking any former opinion, and consequently without revoking our Errour. But here the Excommunication extends to this latter. Where if, by any ones publickly revoking his wicked Errours, be meant only the revoking of the divulging of his wicked Errour, then would such a recantation as this, be sufficient to restore such an excommunicated person to the Churche's Communion; *I hold indeed my former tenent still, but heartily repent, and am sorry, that I have divulged it; nor will I, for the future, do the like.* But such reconciliative recantations we know are never accepted amongst the Reformed, unless such persons condemn also their former Doctrines as false; and acknowledge for true, and Orthodox those of the Church. Again: In this matter I aske; If any one, when required by the Church to declare his opinion, doth affirm such a wicked Errour, to the affirmers whereof the Church hath denounced Excommunication (for Example, affirms the *King* not to be Supreme in Ecclesiastical matters, against the 2*d.* Canon) whether is he not, in such a case, by that Canon liable to Excommunication? If he be, then it is not, because he declareth what he holdeth (for, how can the Church Excommunicate him for doing that, which she requireth of him; *i. e.* for declaring what he holdeth, upon her interrogation)? but, because he holdeth that which he ought not; (*i. e.*) for his opinion, for his wicked Errour; as she there calls it. And doth not the Church of *England* likewise allow of the *King*'s requiring, in the Oath of Supremacy, touching this point, not only a non-affirmation of the contrary, or a non-contradicting of such a truth; but a *sincere acknowledgment in his conscience*, and a believing of it: *I do utterly testify and declare in my conscience* &c.

So also the Parliament 13 *Elizab.* 12. requireth: *That every one, that hath an Ecclesiastical living*, declare his assent, *and subscribe to the 39. Articles of Religion---And that no person be admitted to any*

any Benefice with cure, except he shall first have subscribed the same Articles, with declaration of his unfeigned assent *in the same.* [Here you see the subscription interpreted assent] Now, will the *Church* deny the lawfulness of the Act of the *State*, passed by the Lords *Spiritual*, as well as *Temporal*: Or, may not a Church, though fallible, enjoyn, or require as much acknowledgement, as much assent in a matter of Faith, as the said Church allows a fallible King, or Parliament, to do?

But see Canon 36. Of the same Synod, 1603. where the Church also requires the Subscribers, not only, not to affirm the 3. Articles, contained in that Canon, to be erroneous. Namely, *That the Kings Majesty, is the only Supreme Governour of his Realm in spiritual things.* 2. *That the Book of Common prayer containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God* &c. But in the third Article, (more expresly) requires him to subscribe *That he alloweth, and acknowledgeth,* [(i.e.) confesseth, believeth] *all the 39. Articles to be agreeable to the word of God.*

Add to this; *That, whereas the Canon* 140. *excommunicates, (till they publickly revoke their wicked error) any, who shall affirm; that those, who had not given their voices to the decrees made in the Sacred Synod of this Nation, are not subject to the decrees thereof*; and therefore, in the conference at *Hampton-Court*, the Puritan Party moved this question; *how far* such Ordinances of the Church were to bind them, without impeaching their Christian liberty? They received from the King this answer: *I will have one Doctrine, and Discipline, one Religion in Substance, and Ceremony; and therefore I charge you never to speak more to that point; How far you are bound to obey? When the Church hath ordained it.* This Injunction of King *James* to Puritans, had it been obeyed by the first Reformers, would it not have prevented the birth of Protestantisme, and the dispute at *Hampton-Court*?

Again; the Church of *England*, in some of those Canons, excommunicates men for not doing something, which she *commandeth* to be *done*; now in all such injunctions of Practicals, there is involved an injunction of *assent* first, that such practises are *lawful*. §. 83. n. 2.

The ninth Canon runs thus; *Whosoever shall hereafter separate themselves from the Communion,* &c.--- *in the Church of* England; --- *accounting the Christians, who are conformable to her Doctrine,* &c. *to be profane, and unmeet for them to joyn with, in Christian Profession; let them be excommunicated* ipso facto, *and not restored, till after their repentance, and publick Revocation, of such their wicked errors.* Here the Church of *England* requires

under

under pain of Excommunication, that none do *account* her Communion profane, &c. For whosoever accounteth the Church of *England* such, (her self being judge), ought to separate from her, an erronious conscience obliging. Neither may any say, that the Church here, for his restitution, enjoyns repentance, only for his separating; but rather, for his accounting those, who conform, profane, (1.) for his errors, from which once granted, a separation ought to follow.

Again, Canon 12. *Those, who submit themselves to be ruled by any Ecclesiastical constitutions, made without the Kings authority, are excommunicated.* Here the Canon requiring men not to submit to be governed by such constitutions, requires them to believe also such Ecclesiastical Constitutions to be unlawfully made, and not obliging; else men ought to submit unto them.

Canon 59. *Those Parsons, who do not teach on Sundays the Catechism, set forth in the Common-prayer Book, are excommunicated:* But, if they hold any thing in such Catechism unlawful, they may not teach it; therefore the Synod, in expresly requiring them, under pain of Excommunication, to teach it, virtually, under the same penalty, requires their assent, that it is lawfully to be taught.

§. 83. n. 3. 2. 2ly. In the National Synod, held under King *Charles* 1640. See the third Canon; where it is ordered--- *That all Popish Recusants* [though silent, though nothing affirming, whatever way they can be discovered, whether by their refusing to take the Oath of Allegiance, (which Oath, exacts their punctual assent to several Doctrines,); or by their refusing to receive the Communion with the Members of the Church of *England* (a practice that requires their assent, that this Church is not Schismatical)], *be excommunicated.* Where, whilst the *Church* of *England* thinks, she hath sufficient authority to exclude from her *Communion*, all that hold the *Popish Tenents*, why complains she of the tyranny of the *Roman Church* in excluding from her *Communion* all, that hold the *Protestant Tenents?*

Again, in the fourth Canon it is decreed,--- *That any one, who is accused of Socinianism, unless he will absolutely*, & in terminis, *abjure it, be excommunicated.* Now he that is required, upon pain of Excommunication, to abjure the *Popish*, or the *Socinian* Tenents, is required under the same penalty, so often, to *assent* to the *Protestant*, or the *Anti-Socinian*, Tenents, where ever these are immediately contrary, or contradictory to the other, as many times they are. So whoever is obliged to abjure, *Filium non esse*

Con-

Consubstantialem Patri. Is obliged, by the same Canon, to assent, *Filium esse Consubstantialitatem Patri.*

Lastly, in the sixth Canon, there the Synod requires * *assent*, and approbation of the Doctrine, and Discipline of the Church of *England*, as containing all things necessary to Salvation; and * the *Profession* of this *assent* upon *Oath*. *I* A. B. *do swear, that I do* approve, *and* sincerely acknowledge *the Doctrine, and Discipline established in the Church of* England, *as containing all things necessary to Salvation* [that is, I do assent, and believe it to contain, &c.

Thus much of several *Injunctions*, and *Canons* of the Reformed *Synods* of the Church of *England*, which seem to tye her Subjects to as strict an Obedience of *assent*, and approbation (for any thing I can discern) to all her Doctrine, and Discipline, as any other *Councils* have done; and to give as little liberty to any to oppose her decrees (notwithstanding what she saith of the Church, and of Councils, *Art.* 20. & 21.)

§. 83. n4.

'Hence that complaint of the Presbyterian Ministers, 'concerning their obligation to these Articles, and Canons, in 'their *Reasons, shewing necessity of Reformation*, printed 1660 '--- * *That, if they might not subscribe with such an addition* [so far 'forth, as the same Articles are agreeable to Gods Word], *it 'must needs be granted, that the composers of them are admitted to be* 'infallible; *or else, that the* Statute 13. Elizabeth 12. *intendeth to 'tyrannize over the* Consciences *of men* [i. e. in requiring them to 'profess what their conscience tells them, is not truth]. --- * *That 'the Statute requireth* Belief *of every one of these Articles, when it 'enjoyns not only subscription, but an assent unto them; punishing all 'with deprivation, that shall affirm and maintain any Doctrine repug-'nant to them; which every man must do, if they be found contrariant 'to the Word; or he must be false to God.*--- And p. 36. Concerning 'obligation to Ceremonies; * *That these ought not to be imposed 'on those, who cannot be fully perswaded in their own minds, and con-'sciences, that they are lawful; and therefore must sin, if they use 'them.* Thus the Presbyterians.

'Yet this course, as most necessary, was long ago 'hinted by Mr. *Calvin*, to the first *Founder* of the English 'Reformation, the Lord *Protector*, in the days of *Edward* 'the Sixth, ---- *Expedit quidem* (saith he) *prospicere desultoris Ingeniis, quæ sibi nimium licere volunt; claudenda est etiam janua 'curiosis doctrinis. Ratio autem expedita ad eam rem una est; Si 'extet nempe* summa *quædam* doctrinæ *ab omnibus recepta, quam in-'ter prædicandum sequantur omnes, ad quam etiam observandam*

'omnes Episcopi,& Parochi jurejurando adstringantur; ut nemo ad mu-
'nus Ecclæsiasticum admittatur, nisi spondeat sibi illum doctrinæ con-
'sensum inviolatum futurum---Quod ad formulam precum, & rituum
'Ecclæsiasticorum, valde probo ut certa illa extet, a qua Pastoribus disce-
'dere in functione sua non liceat--ut obviam eatur desultoriæ quorundam
'levitati, qui novationes quasdam affectant. Here I understand him to require the Clergy to be obliged by Oath to receive, and Preach such a certain forme of Doctrine, and to practice such Ecclesiastical Rites as shall be agreed upon by their Governours. In which thing if He speaks reason; what can more justify the proceedings of the Church-Catholick, in restraining not only her Subjects tongues, but tenents, and opinions, in matters which she judgeth of necessary belief.]

§.84.n.1. Notwithstanding these evidences cited above, implying *assent* required to the Articles of the Church of *England*, yet her Divines, when charged therewith by Roman Catholicks, do return many answers and Apologies, whereby they seem either to deny any such thing; or at least do pretend a moderation therein very different from the Roman Tiranny.

[α] 1rst. Then they say. [α] *That they require not any* oath, [β] *but a* Subscription *only to these their Articles.* ‖ 2. [β] *Require subscription only from* their own, *not from* strangers. *See* Bishop Bramhall *vindic.* p. 155.——And——*This Church prescribes only to her own Children, whereas the Church of* Rome *severely imposeth her Doctrine upon the whole World;* saith Bishop Lawd ‖ 3. [γ] *Nor yet require it of* all *their own, but only of those, who seek to be initiated into holy Orders, or are to be admitted to some Ecclesiastical preferment* ‖ 4. [δ] *These Articles not penned with* Anathemas, *or curses, against all those, even of* their own, *who do not receive them.* 5ly. [ε] Subscription *not required to them, as Articles of their* Faith; *or at least, as all of them Articles* Fundamental *of their* Faith; *as belief is required to all hers as such, by the Church of* Rome; *but only required to them, as* Theological veritie‖, *and* Inferiour truths† [To this purpose *Bishop Bramhall* Reply p. 350 —— 'We do use to subscribe unto them indeed, not as 'Articles of Faith; but as Thelogical verities, for the preservation of 'unity among our selves.——Again‖——Though perhaps some of our 'negatives were reveald truths, and consequently were as necessary 'to be believed, when they are known, as affirmatives; yet they do not 'therefore become such necessary truths, or Articles of Religion, as 'make up the rule of Faith; which rule of Faith (he saith there) 'consists of such supernatural truths, as are necessary to be known of every

‖ *Bishop Bramhal* Reply to *Chal.* p. 264.

‖ p. 52.

‖ *Bishop Bramhal* vind. p. 156.

‖ *Bramh.* Reply p. 350.

† *Stillingfleet* p. 54.

‖ *Ib.* p. 277.

'ry Christian, *not only* necessitate præcepti, *because God hath com-*
'*manded us to believe them* ||; *but also* necessitate medii, *because, with-* || See Schism
'*out the knowledge of them, in some tolerable degree, according to the* guarded p.396
'*measure of our capacities, we cannot in an ordinary way attain to*
'*Salvation*——And, ||——*We do not* (saith he) *hold our* 39. *Articles to* || Reply p.264.
'*be such necessary truths*, extra quas non est salus; *nor enjoyn Eccle-*
'*siastick persons to swear unto them*; *but only to subscribe them, as*
'*Theological truths*---And thus the Arch Bishop || *All points are made* || p. 51.
'Fundamental, *and that to all mens belief, if that* Church [the Ro-
'man] *hath once determined them*; *whereas the* Church *of* England
'*never declared, that every one of her Articles are Fundamental in the*
'*Faith.*]

To which they add. [ζ] That as for those of these Articles, *that are* positive doctrines, *and Articles of their Faith, they are such, as are grounded in Scripture, and General Truths, about which there is no controversy* ||--*and such* (saith Mr. Stillingfleet †) *as have the testimony, and approbation of the whole Christian World of all ages, and are acknowledged to be such by* Rome it self. ζ || *Bramh.* vindic. p. 159. † p. 54.

[η] And then; as for the rest of those Articles; *they are only* negative (*as the* Arch *Bishop* ||); *refuting there, where the thing affirmed by the Roman-Church is not affirmed by Scripture, nor directly to be concluded out of it*; ---*Or* (as Bishop Bramhall ||)--*They are no* new *articles, or innovations obtruded upon any*; *but* negations *only of humane controverted Traditions* †; *and Refutations of the Roman suppositious principles* ||--And *though some of them were revealed truths*, &c. as before, *yet do they not therfore make up the rule of Faith* || [*i. e.* as this Rule is before explained.] η || p. 52. || Vindic. p. 159 † Reply p. 279. || *Ib.* p. 277.

[θ] 6ly. That such subscription, whether of *positives*, or *negatives* is required by the Church of *England* to a few, in comparison of that multitude of Articles made on the other side. *Though the* Church *of* England, (saith the Archb. ||) *denounce Excommunication, as is before expressed*; *yet she comes far short of the* Church *of* Romes *severity*; *whose* Anathema's *are not only for* 39. *Articles, but for very many more*; *about one hundred, in matter of Doctrine.* θ || p. 51.

7ly. [κ] Concerning the just importance, and extent of such subscription, several expressions I find, that the Subscribers do not stand obliged thereby * to believe these Articles; and the reason given, because the Church is fallible; but only * not to oppose, not to contradict, them. κ § 84. n. 2.

['To this purpose---*We do not look* (saith Bishop Bram-
'hall ||) *upon the Articles of the* Church *of* England, *as Essentials*
'*of saving Faith, or Legacies of* Christ, *and his* Apostles; *but, in a* || *Bishop Bramh.* Schism garded p. 190--- *Stillingf.* p. 55.

'*mean, as pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity; neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them.* — And— Si quis diversum dixerit, *we question him* — Si quis diversum senserit, *if any man think otherwise in his private opinion, and trouble not the peace of the Church, we question him not* ‖— Again: — [λ] *Never any son of the Church of* England *was punished for dissenting from the Articles in his judgement, so he did not publish it by word, or writing.*— After the same manner speaks Mr. *Stillingfleet*‖.— *The Church of* England *excommunicates such, as openly oppose her Doctrine; supposing her fallible; the Roman Church excommunicates all, who will not believe, whatever she defines to be infallibly true.* — And — *The Church of* England *bindeth men to peace to the Churches Determinations, (reserving to men the liberty of their judgements) on pain of Excommunication, if they violate that peace.*— And Mr. *Chillingworth* saith, ‖ — *That Protestants cannot, with coherence to their own grounds, require of others the belief of any thing besides Scripture, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable, consequences of it without most high, and most Schismatical presumption* [*plain, irrefragable, indubitable, consequences*; such therefore cannot be the most of the 39. Articles, we know by how great a part of Christianity controverted, denied.] Lastly, thus the Arch-bishop answering to the fifth Canon of the Church of *England* objected by *A. C.* ‖ — *It's one thing for a man to hold an opinion privately within himself; and another thing, boldly, and publickly to affirm it.* [as if that Canon prohibited only the latter of these] This then seems of late the commoner exposition of subscription, and most suitable to the Protestant Principles.']

‖ Vindic. p. 156.

λ

‖ P. 104.

‖ P. 375.

‖ P. 51.

§. 84. n. 3.

8. But 8ly.---[×]Some other expressions also fall from the same Writers, and others, intimating *assent* required.

For 1st. The Arch-bishop saith, concerning the fifth Article; that, *perhaps* only publick affirmation, is the sence of it, but speaks nothing clearly against *assent* required by it; and I suppose, he saw good reason for it. I pray you view the place in him. So, in the precedent page, he saith,--*The Church of* England *is not such a shrew to her Children, as to deny her blessing, or denounce an Anathema against them, if some peaceably dissent in some particulars, remoter from the Foundation.* [Where this restriction, *remoter from the Foundation*, seems so to indulge dissent, in respect of some of the 39. Articles; as that she doth not allow it generally in respect of them all; unless any will say, all the Articles are such] — So Mr. *Whitby*‖ in his Answer to Mr. *Cressy* amongst other (ifs) puts in this for one,— *If they* [the English Church-Governours] *require*

‖ P. 100.

a

a positive assent, it is because the thing determined, is to be evident in Scripture, &c. *We do use* (saith Bishop *Bramhall* ‖) *to subscribe unto them indeed, not as Articles of Faith, but as Theological verities*, [Is not this a subscribing, that they assent to, or hold them for Theological *verities*]— So p.264. *We do require Ecclesiastical persons only to subscribe them as Theological Truths, for the preservation of unity among us, and the extirpation of some growing* errors— (and Mr. *Stillingfleet* useth the same expression from him). [*To subscribe them as Theological Truths*; meaneth he not here, to subscribe, that they are Theological Truths? *For the preservation of unity*; means he not, unity of *Opinion*, and of the Profession of such Truths? As the title also prefixed to the Articles, (mentioned before ‖), imports; saying,— *That the Articles were drawn up for the avoiding diversities of Opinions, and establishing consent*; Else: where diversity of Opinion is allowed in all things, what *extirpation of errours* (which follows in the next words) can be hoped? ‖ Reply p.349. ‖ §.83. n.11.

9 [μ] Lastly, I find frequent mention in these Authors of a *conditional assent*, or *belief*, required (in general) as due to the Churches propos'als, whether concerning matters of Faith, or other constitutions: (yet without any particular application thereof to the 39. Articles.) *Conditional, viz.*—*Then*, * *when a person is not competent to search her grounds*,—*or*,* *where the Church adheres to, and forsakes no part of, the Apostles* depositum—*or* * *when she proveth, and evidenceth to them the truth of what she proposeth*; *or*, * *so long, as they cannot evidence and prove to her the contrary. But then*; *they leave the judgement of this condition, (when she sufficiently proves such a thing, or they the contrary; when the party is not competent to search grounds, or when the Church adheres not to the Apostles* Depositum) *to themselves*; and not to the Church; reserving to every *private* person the *ultimate* judgement; a judgement *of discretion*, as they call it. See Dr. *Ferne*'s Case between the two Churches, p.40.48,49.— Division of Churches, p. 45.47, 61.— Considerations, p.19.— Dr. *Feild* p.666.— Dr. *Jackson* on the Creed. *l.*2.§.1. c.5. & 6. (out of which, see some Quotations, before, §.20.)— Dr. *Hammond*'s answer, to a Catholick Gentleman, p. 16. 17.— *Dispatcher dispatched*, c.5. p.358. §.84.n.4. μ

Having seen this defence of *Learned Protestants* for the Church of *England* her composing *new Articles* of Religion, and exacting of her Subjects *subscription*, and *conformity* to them; wherein they endeavour to represent, the Yoke of these her *Articles*, and her *Excommunications* very light (though the Presbyterians §.85.n.1.

rians groan under the weight thereof), in comparison of that of the *Roman Canons*, and their *Anathemas*. Now give me leave, to make some reflection on what they have said; and out of these to return answers to the precedents, so far as it seems necessary

Obj. 1. 1st. Then, this is clear; that, they confining their *Rule of Faith* within as narrow a compass as they please, yet some of their 39. Articles will be found to be a *part* of it; *and to be such supernatural truths, as are necessary to be known of every Christian*, necessitate medii, *and such, as* extra quos non est salus; as well as some of those in *Pius's* Bull, or in the Council of *Trent*, are. Of this sort must several of the 1st. 8. Articles be, concerning *the Trinity, Son of God*, &c. And I ask, whether they are not willing, that some other of them [as [8.] *The fall of Adam*: [18.] *Salvation only by Christ*; [15.] *Christ only without sin*; [11.] *Justification by Faith only*; [25. 27.] *Two Sacraments ordained by Christ, and these not only bare signs but effectual Instruments of Grace*; [6.] *Sufficiency of the holy Scripture for Salvation*] be admitted into the *Rule* of the *Protestants Faith*; but thrown amongst *Theological*, and *inferior, verities*. Since then it is most certain, that some of their *Articles* are part, of their *Rule*, and of the most necessary, and fundamental Faith: Next, I ask concerning these; whether, in the liberty they profess in their Church, and the want of it they accuse in the Roman, they require no *assent* from their Subjects, or at least from those of them, whom they admit to *H.* Orders, and Ecclesiastical Preferments, to *these Articles?* or whether they do not require them to *profess* and *teach* all, or some of them at least? which they cannot do, unless they also oblige them to hold them: (for none may profess against what he thinks; and therefore who is tyed by them to profess so, is by them tyed to think so). But if they do not require such *assent*; then may one, that holds against them the Contrary ~~Roman~~ Doctrines, in several of the prime Articles of their Faith, not only enjoy their Communion, but sit down among their Doctors; only, if as he believeth, professeth, or teacheth none of these Articles, so he do not teach, or profess the contrary, but spend his discourses on other subjects. See now whether there may not be some reason for that which is observed before, §. 84. n. 3. concerning. the Arch-bishop.

Obj. 2. §. 85. n. 2. 2ly. Concerning those other Articles, of which it is said, that they are no *new positive* Articles of the Protestant Faith, but only *negations*, and refutations of new Roman assertions, and

and additions. You may note concerning them, 1st. In General: that Negatives may be Scripture-truths, revealed therein, matter of our Faith, and *as necessary to be believed* (as Bishop Bramhall granteth ‖) *when known to be revealed, as any affirmative, and positive Articles are*; and the most Fundamental Articles may be as well negatively, as affirmatively proposed; and, seeing that the one necessarily implies, and inferrs the other, as one is *ratione medii* necessary to Salvation, so is the other. So the negative Articles in the *Nicen*, or *Athanasian* Creed *Pater non creatus--a nullo genitus--non tres Patres--Filius non factus--Filius unus non conversione divinitatis in carnem, aut confusione Substantiarum*--are Articles of as necessary belief as the positives; and indeed, the same with them; the same with--- *Pater unus--Pater eternus,--Filius genitus,--Filius ex duabus naturis consistens.* And they as much Hereticks, that *affirm* any of these *negatives*, as that *deny* the *affirmative*. 2ly. Concerning the Negatives, in the 39. Articles of the Church of *England*, if they be well considered, you may find; that they are both, in the Articles, pretended to be *Scripture*, and revealed truths; and that all, or most of them are equivalent to affirmatives; and as *new*, and *positive* on the one side, as the Roman Articles, which they contradict are pretended, on the other; and the Protestants Confession of Faith (supposing him obliged to believe these Negatives) as large, and as particular on the one side, as the Roman, or Tridentine is on the other, as to the maine Controversies that are bandied between the two Churches; and these not only *privatively*, but *positively* opposite. For no difference can be made in the thing (but only in the expression) between a negative, and positive Article, where the negative implies, and is equivalent to, the affirmative of its contrary; as it is, where the contraries are *immediate*, and the one of them is necessarily put, wherever the other denied. As, God being granted a substance, He that *denies* him to be a *corporeal* substance, in this he *affirmes* him to be a *Spiritual*; and so, those that deny here something which others affirme, in this must needs affirme somthing, which the others deny; and the negative may be (as we please) changed into another positive; and he who had before the positive, shall have now the negative side. He, that denies any Soules after this life to go into any temporal purgatory, affirms them to go into Bliss, or Pain, Eternal; and he that affirms Purgatory, denies this; So, he that denies a *Transubstantiation* in the Eucharist, affirmes the *Substance* of the *Symboles* to remain there; and so *e contra*. Hence he that hath 39. Articles of his Faith, whereof 30. are in the expression negative, 9. positive, hath, in matters, wherein,

‖ Reply to *Chalced* p. 227.

wherein, the one contrary being excluded, the other is admitted (as it is in most of these Articles of Religion, that are in debate) no fewer positive Articles of his Faith, than he, who hath 39. expresly positive; and again, he who hath 39 positive cannot but have 39. Negative also, and *e contra*: (only a negative confession argues a former contest). And as *Faith*, so *Heresie*, is conversant in either.

And here also note: that it is one thing for a Church meerly to exclude from, or omit, in her Articles, or confessions of Faith, those points, which another Church defineth: (*i.e.*) not to tye her Subjects to believe them; and another thing, to tye her Subjects to believe the Negatives of them, or not to believe them. Which is indeed a defining one way, as much as the other Church doth the other way. For Example: 'Tis one thing, not to tye her subjects to believe or hold, *the Roman Doctrine, concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Images, Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints*, &c. and another thing, to tye her subjects to believe, or hold, *that the Romish Doctrines concerning Purgatory*, &c. *are vainly invented, or grounded on no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God:* as it is in the 22. *Article* Ecclesiæ Anglic. Neither can the Church of *Rome* be here more justly questioned, in her not leaving points in Universals only, and their former indifferency; but new-stating *Purgatory, Transubstantiation*, &c. than the Reformed, for their new-stating the *contrary* to these.

§. 85. n. 3. Which to make more perspicuous: It is to be noted, that of those, who seem in their Theological Positions to affirm less, and so to make fewer Articles of their Faith, than some others do, there are two sorts. 1. Either such, as peremptorily deny the truth of those additionals, which the other affirm. 2. Or such, as do suspend their judgement concerning such additionals; neither affirming, nor denying them for truths; only denying, that the others as yet do prove, or evidence them to be so. Now though it may be said of these later; that indeed they do not make so many Articles of Faith, or new definitions, as the other do; and so also, that they seem much more safe, and modest in the *paucity* of their *Credends*; because they, who neither affirm, nor deny a Tenent, cannot *err* in it; yet the former, who deny as far, and as peremptorily every new point, as the other affirm it, these can free themselves from no curiosity, tyranny, liableness to errour, *&c.* wherein they pretend the other to transgress: nor can plead any safety in their Doctrine, (*viz.* in their not erring, because not *determining*); but do ingage every

every whit as far in such points, as their adversaries do; one in holding, and endeavouring to prove such a thing a truth; the other in holding, and endeavouring to prove it an error. And this is the case of the Church of *England*; which suspends not her judgment in those new points which the *Roman* defines; nor denies them onely to be *proved*, or *clear*, in the Scripture; but denies them as *Errors*, and things *contrary* to Scripture: So: *Purgatory*, *Adoration of Images and Reliques*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Indulgences*, are declared repugnant to Gods Word, Art. 22.— *Works of Supererogation*, Art. 14.— *Publick Prayer*, or *Ministery of the Sacraments in a Tongue not understood by the People*, Art. 24.— *Denying of the Cup to the People*, Art. 30.— *Sacrifice of the Maß*, Art. 31.— *Transubstantiation*, Art. 28. Now he that believes Transubstantiation, for Example, to be contrary to Scripture, makes the contrary to Transubstantiation to be Scripture, and so to be also a point of his Faith, if Scripture be so: and hence the English Church in obliging her Subjects to believe these points Errors, which, the Roman Church doth hers to believe Truths, hath in his as large a Creed as the other: if the other hath *Twelve* new Articles, so, in her stating the contrary to them, hath she; and is equally tyrannical (or more, because the Articles of the other are the elder of the two;) the Subjects of the one having no liberty left to affirm them; as, of the other, to deny them. For Example. A Subject of the Church of *England* (supposing him obliged to believe her Articles true) hath no more liberty left to hold Transubstantiation a Truth, than a Romanist hath to hold it an Error: Or, (to instance in the implyed affirmative, that is maintained in opposition to Transubstantiation on the Church of *Englands* side,) a Subject of this Church hath no more liberty left to hold the remaining of the Substance of the Symbols in the Eucharist an Error, than those of the Roman have, to hold it a Truth. This of the first sort: those, who as peremptorily deny a thing, as the others affirm it. But next, you may observe; that neither are the later sort, who suspend their judgment, because such point seems not proved to them, in this always the most secure, and safe, If the proposers to them of that point, be such persons as they are commanded to believe, unless themselves can prove the contrary to it; which is the case of all those, who have Spiritual Superiors; and if the knowledge of such a Truth be any way profitable to their Salvation; which Truths, I suppose, these Superiors never define, without foreseeing, First, such Doctrines, defined, beneficial to be known. This from §. 85. n. 2. is my 2d. Observation concerning the Church of *Englands* negative Articles.

§. 85. n. 4. *Obs.* 3. ‖§. 85. n. 1.

3ly. You may observe: that, when these Protestant Writers say, that these 39 Articles (that is, the most of them, or the negatives, see Observation 1.‖) are not made by them Articles of their Faith, they explain themselves to mean, not made *fundamental* Articles of their Faith; or such, the belief of which is necessary *ratione medii* for attaining salvation; and such, as *extra quas* ‖§ 84. n. 1. [*creditas*] *non est salus*‖; they meanwhile not denying; that whatever is *Scripture*, and a *revealed Divine Truth*, is an *Article* of our *Faith*, *i.e.* (as Bp. *Bramhall*) *Necessary to be believed, and assented to by us, when it is known to be revealed.* Now, as *they* do not make the most of their 39 Articles, the *rule*, or articles, of their *Faith*, in the forenamed sense; so neither doth the *Roman Church*, or *Council* of *Trent*, her Canons; whatever Protestants tell the World, so often, to the contrary: *Fundamental* indeed they call, sometimes, all points defined by the Churches Councils; and hold them *necessary* to be believed, for attaining salvation; but, not *necessary* in such a sense, as *ratione medii* necessary; or absolutely *extra quas* [*creditas*] *non est salus*; but onely necessary to be believed upon supposition of a *sufficient proposal* of them, to any person, that they have been so *defined*. Again, necessarily to be believed also, for attaining *Salvation*; not because that no person can be saved, and that, after the Churches definition of them, in his not believing them; But because if, after such proposal, and sufficient notice given him of their being defined, he believe them not, he now stands guilty (in this his disobedience to his supreme spiritual Guides) of a *mortal* sin (unrepented of) destructive of his *Salvation.*

§. 85. n. 5. ‖p. 48, 49.

'A thing spoken plainly enough by the answerer of the 'Archbishops Book, and yet misrepresented by the Replier, ‖who 'imposeth these propositions as maintained by the Roman Church: '*That what the Church determines as matter of Faith, is as necessary* 'to be believed in order to Salvation, as that which is necessary from 'the matter, [i.e. *necessary, ratione medii.*] — *And that an equal* 'explicit faith is required to the definitions of the Church, as to the Ar- 'ticles of the Creed; and that there is an equal necessity in order to 'Salvation, of believing both of them:* Whenas he might easily have 'informed himself, that there is not an *equal* necessity required by 'the Roman Church of the very Articles of the Creed in order to 'Salvation; and whenas, not onely this *one* condition, of the 'Churche's having defined them (for none are obliged necessarily 'to believe explicitly whatsoever the Church hath defined;) but a '*second*, also, of a sufficient proposal to us of what the Church hath 'defined,

'defined, renders her Definitions necessary to be believed: and 'then, necessary to be believed indeed as to the doing of our duty 'in order to our Salvation; but not all of them necessary to be 'believed, as if the knowledg of them were so necessary to our 'Salvation, as that without this it could not be had, as that of some 'of the Articles of the Creed is. Neither is the *Greek* 'Church (one ground of this authors mistake) by F. *Fisher*, or o-'thers of the Roman Church, charged as guilty of *Heresie*, in 'any other manner save this; that, supposing a lawful General 'Council, accepted by the Church Catholick, to have defined *The* '*procession of the H. Ghost à Filio*, so many of the Greek Church as 'have received a *sufficient proposal*, that such a Council hath so 'defined it, if they continue to deny, or disbelieve it, are guilty 'of *Heresie*; leaving the rest free; (unless it can be proved, that '*à Filio* is a Fundamental in the other sense, *i. e. ratione medii*;) *free* 'I say, so many amongst them as happen to be either by natural 'defect and incapacity, or external want of instruction, *invincibly* 'and *inculpably* ignorant, either of the just authority of such a 'Council; or, of its Divinely assisted inerrability in all necessa-'ries; or, of such its Decree; or, of the true sense thereof; 'which persons indeed, by reason of the *evidence* of all these things, 'cannot be the most, or the learned; but yet, may be some; for 'all in an Heretical Church are not affirmed *Hereticks*; though the 'Churches censures, according to the reasonable grounds of con-'viction concerning any such point generally published, are passed 'upon all that are involved in such a Society; whilst God, who 'knows all capacities, absolves from them whom he seeth inno-'cent; and preserves his Wheat from the fire, though, by the 'Church bound in the same bundle with the Tares. As 'for the other ground of the Replyers mistake; ‖ That famous ‖ *Stillin.* p. 48. 'passage of *Pius*, [*Hanc veram Catholicam Fidem, extra quam &c.*] 'he might have learn'd to have made a more moderate and quali-'fied construction of it, from his own descant on the like clause 'in the Athanasian Creed, [*Hæc est Fides Catholica quam nisi quis-*'*que &c.*] where he ‖ could well discover a *conditional* necessity, as ‖ p. 70, 71. 'to some of the *Articles* thereof, *viz.* A necessity of believing them 'upon *conviction*, that they were of Divine Revelation: why not 'then allow such a one here: *extra quam nulla salus, i. e.* to such as 'receive a sufficient proposal of their being so defined; and there-'fore do, or might, receive a sufficient conviction, that they must 'also be Divine Truth? Though for a fuller answer to that clause 'of *Pius*, I must refer you to the considerations on the Council of 'Trent, §. 80. n. 2. Now to proceed in our Discourse.]

§. 85. n. 6. *Fundamental* therefore the Church of *Rome* affirms *many* of her Canons (for I speak not of all) not so to be; but that 1st. A Christian may be ignorant of them, without loss of his salvation; and indeed, amongst the vulgar, who is there, that is not ignorant of several of them? Onely in time of need, and where danger of seducement, as any Canon is of greater moment, or the truth thereof particularly invaded, the Pastors are vigilant to inform their Sheep of the Churches former definitions of them.

2ly. Nay further, may hold the contrary to *some* of them though defined, yet if not sufficiently proposed to him, that they are so, without loss of salvation. 3ly. In ones holding the contrary to them, after sufficiently proposed, (I mean, both the decree manifested to him, and the just authority that made it, and the divine assistance thereof) the loss of salvation doth not ensue, nor the Churche's censures take hold on such a person, for the simple non-believing the matter of such Canon, or for the holding of the contrary. [For if this, *the meer non-believing*, or *the holding of the contrary* to *any* Church-definition whatever, abstracting from a sufficient proposal that such thing hath been defined by the Church, were enough to destroy any ones salvation; then so this would be, before the Churches determination of such Point; or so would be to the invincibly ignorant, after it; a thing which no Catholick affirms; and see S. *Austins* stating of this matter, *de Baptis.* 4. 16. before §. 18. Though it is freely granted here, that the ignorance of such a truth as is beneficial for our salvation, (which all definitions of Councils are supposed to be, to some or other) both after, and also before the Councils defining thereof, may confer something, in its degree, according to the benefit of the truth one miscarries in, to the loss of his salvation.] The Churche's censures therefore, I say, as to many of her Canons, are incurr'd, and salvation ruin'd, not for the *meer disbelieving* such Point defined; but for *obstinately* doing this after sufficient ground of conviction, that such an authority hath so defin'd it. — *Postquam ea quæ ad fidem pertinent authoritate Universalis Ecclesiæ determinata sunt, si quis tali ordinationi* pertinaciter *repugnat, hæreticus censetur*[ii]. — *Qui autem ex ignorantiâ crassâ vel etiam affectatâ* (saith *Layman* † out of the common Doctrine of the Casuists †) *propter inquirendi tædium &c. errorem aliquem contra fidem tenet, eum statim derelicturus, si intelligat Catholicæ Ecclesiæ repugnantem esse, talis non est* pertinax *nec* Hæreticus. So that the Churches *Anathema*, in many of her Canons, seizeth on a person, not so much for the matter of his error, (though this not denied to some degree hurtful to him, and diminishing his perfection in the Faith) as the *pertinacy* of his erring,

[ii] S. Thom. 22. 11. q. 2.

† Theol moral. l. 2 Tract. 1 13. c.

erring, and the contumacie and perverſeneſs of his will, diſobeying the Church and his Spiritual Superiors, ſufficiently manifeſting the contrary truth to be her Doctrine, and a portion of the Chriſtian Faith; and manifeſting it always for ſome good ends, of preſerving her Sons orthodox in ſuch parts thereof, as ſhe ſees to be invaded by ſome contrary error of perilous conſequence. Now let it be conſidered, whether the Church of *England*, if the ſenſe of the 5. Canon (related above[ll]) ſtand good, doth not make her 39 Articles Fundamental, and exclude from Salvation thoſe, who affirm, or hold any of them erroneous, on the ſame manner: whilſt ſhe excommunicates, *i.e.* cuts off from the Body of Chriſt (if the Excommunication be juſt, as ſhe thinks it is) ſuch perſons, as remain in this wicked error, till ſuch time as they repent, and publickly revoke it. For, I ask, what is this wicked error, for which, unrepented of, he is ſo cut off from Chriſt, and conſequently his Salvation deſtroyed; but his holding, or (if you will) his not repenting upon her Admonition, but perſiſting to hold the contrary to ſome one, or more of her Articles, or Definitions? if ſhe declare then his Salvation loſt in his holding the contrary to ſuch Article; is not the Article then after her propoſal made, in the ſenſe we are ſpeaking of, fundamental to him? Or, ſuppoſe his wicked error be not holding, but ſaying the contrary to ſuch Article, when he holds otherwiſe; (which I cannot apprehend to be ſenſe, *i.e.* that any one can be ſaid to erre in a thing, when he ſaith onely, that he holds it, but really doth not hold it) at leaſt thus far then, as to non-contradiction, the Article ſtill is made fundamental, for here whoever contradicts (unrepenting thereof) is damned.

[ll] §. 83. n. 1.

4[ly]. For the application of *Hæc eſt Fides, extra quam non eſt ſalus*, which is ſo often ſaid, by Proteſtants, to be made to all the Definitions of the Council of *Trent*; and the confeſſion thereof neceſſary to the enjoying of the Communion of this Church. 1*ſt*. No ſuch Sentence is applied to the definitions by the Council it ſelf, (except onely to the *Nicene* Creed; of which they ſay: it is *Fundamentum firmum & unicum*, Seſſ. 3.) but onely by a Pope, after it. And 2[ly]. If we ſhould alſo grant the ſenſe of this clauſe to be that, which Proteſtants put upon it, (whereas it is capable of another ſenſe, which they cannot diſallow, of which ſee *Conſid. Conc. Trid.* §. 80.) namely this; *That an* explicit *belief of* every one *of the Definitions, and Canons of* all *the lawful General Councils, that have ever been, or made any ſuch,* [for *Pius* ſpeaks of *all* Canons of Councils, as well as thoſe of *Trent*] *is neceſſary to every one, and that* ratione medii, *for attaining Salvation*: For thus the Proteſtants will needs underſtand it, (a thing ſo irrational, that any one may ſee, that a

Church, that holds this, must damn all, or most of her children; for who is there, especially among the laity or vulgar, that hath an actual knowledg, or explicit faith, of every Canon of every lawful General Council, that hath been in the Church?) Yet is it not required by *Pius* of *all men*, that they assent to this truth for their enjoying the Roman Communion, but onely of those, who enter into *Sacred Orders*, or *Religions*. But 5ly. It may be noted also concerning this Bull of *Pius*, which seems, of a long time, the main grievance of Protestants; the main Apology for their relinquishing the *Roman* communion, and that, in which she is chiefly charged to have violated the Unity of the Catholick Church, ‖ that it came forth many years after the Protestants *discession* from this Church; whether we look at *Luther's*; or that under King *Edward*; or the last under Queen *Elisabeth*; and many years too, after the birth of their *XXXIX Articles* made against the *Roman Faith*; both after those composed under *Edward* VI. *A. D.* 1549; and reconfirmed under Queen *Elisabeth*, 1562. This Bull not being made till 1564. So that, herein, they seem to take their chiefest excuse for their discession from that Church, from a thing that hapned long after it: as if they departed from it out of the foresight of an offense, which, though it then was not, yet would be given them, by it.

‖ *Stillin.* p. 55.

§. 85. n. 7. *Obs.* 4.

The 4th. thing I have to observe to you (touched before) is; that, though the Church of *England* in her Synod, affixeth not particular *Anathemaes* to her Articles, as the Roman-Catholick doth in that of *Trent*, with a *Si quis dixerit &c. Anathema sit*; yet the forementioned 5th Canon of this Church pronounceth in general an Excommunication to a *Si quis affirmaverit*, that any of these Articles is, in any part, erroneous. The weighty value of which Excommunication also you may learn out of their *Art.* 33.

§. 85. n. 8. Resp to *α*.

These things premised: now to speak briefly to the former Protestant-Defence made, §. 84. n. 1. *&c.* To [*α*]. I answer; that, by the instances in the Canons *&c.* produced before §. 83. n. 1. and some of the expressions §. 84. n. 3. the Church-Governours intention in requiring this Subscription seems to be, *Assent*.

To *β*.

To [*β*] That as the Church of *England* requires submission to her Articles onely from her own Children, or Subjects: So doth the Council of *Trent*; whose Subjects, if it be a *general* one, ‖ is all Christianity; if a Patriarchal, ‖ all the Western Churches; and amongst the rest that of *England*.

‖ Of which see *Consid. on Coun of Trent* §. 15 *&c.*

‖ Of which see *Ib* §. 43.

To

To [γ]. That as subscription to the Articles in the Church of *England* is only required from those, who are to be initiated into holy Orders, or admitted to Ecclesiastical Preferments; so is *Pius*'s oath to the Canons, only exacted from those, who enter into sacred Orders, or Religions. But as the *Anathemaes* in the Council of *Trent* extend to all persons, so doth the Excommunication of the Church of *England*. *Can.* 5. To γ.

To [δ]. That, though these are not penned with a *particular Anathema*, yet they are with a *general Excommunication*. *Can.* 5. To δ.

To [ε]. That as not by them to their *Articles*; so neither by the Church of *Rome* to her *Canons*, is subscription required as to Articles of her Faith, or Articles Fundamental, if *Faith* or *Fundamental* be understood in such a sense, as the Protestant quotations above explain them: This hath been shewed, § 85. n. 5, 6. To ε.

To [ζ]. By this it is confessed, that of the 39 Articles no more are Articles of the Church of *England's* Faith, than those only, wherein *Rome* doth agree with her; and then, if to the rest of her Articles, no assent be exacted of any, as is contended above, § 84. one, in all things *believing*, and being of the same perswasion with the Church of *Rome*, is freely admitted into the Church of *Englands* Communion; nay, may (without violation of her constitutions) lawfully enter into her holy Orders, and Ecclesiastical preferments, and there remain without any engagement, to defend the Church of *England's* Doctrine; or teach, and instruct the people against the *Roman* Errors. To ζ.

To [η]. That her *Negative* Articles involve Affirmatives (and those too pretended divine Revelations; see before §. 85. *n.* 3. which are the objects of *Faith*) and do bind so strictly on one side, as the *Roman* Canons do on the other; and, supposing assent required to them, do admit as little latitude of opinion; and at *Luther's* appearance the matter of these *Roman* Canons, being in possession, as to the common belief, and practice of the Church, these Negatives of them, of the two, will prove the *Innovations*. To η.

Lastly, In what sense Protestants say, these *Negatives* are no Articles of their Faith (*i.e.* faith necessary *ratione medii* to salvation) in the same sense the *Roman* Church saith, neither are her Positives, that contradict them.

To [θ]. Of the many *Canons* in the Council of *Trent*, made in opposition to them, *Luthers* many errors and innovations of Doctrine which were daily collected and brought into the Council, were the cause. And, as to the *main Points* that are in debate between the Church of *Rome*, and of *England*, the Negatives in the *English* Articles equal the Affirmatives in the Canons of *Trent*. To θ.

To

To κ

To [κ]. Whether *assent* to the Articles be required in subscription, or only *non contradiction*, as to any uniform accord in their later Writers, I see nothing clear, (and the later seems more agreeable with their Principles): but in the former instances out of some Canons, &c. assent seems as strictly required in this Church, and that upon Excommunication, as in the *Roman* upon *Anathemaes*: and the Act of Parliament *Elisabeth* 13. recited before §. 83. n. 1. (an Act passed, not only by the Lords Temporal, but Spiritual, *i. e.* the Governours of this Church) is most expres for it. Review it.

‖ §. 83. n. 1.

§. 85. n. 9.

To λ

To [λ]. It is true also in the *Roman* Church, that thought is free; and, *Ecclesia non judicat de occultis*; or, *peccatis merè internis*, *i. e.* no way discovered; but true also, that the Ecclesiastical Magistrate may lawfully *inquire* into mens thoughts and *beliefs*, and question a person herein (for this is done in Baptism) and that not only *words* are punishable as faults, by this Magistrate, but *thoughts*, if any one shall reveal, that he thinks so; *i. e. thoughts* when they are any way discovered (as any one, upon examination, manifesting any blasphemous thoughts or tenents of his, may be lawfully excommunicated; and, in such a case, is excommunicated, not for the revealing them in word, but for the holding them; so, who designes a treason, and afterward reveals it, is justly punished; not for the revealing, but *designing* thereof); and this the Church of *Rome* doth; and if the Church of *England* extend not her Inquisition, or censures thus far, especially as to those persons she admits into the Clergy, she may expect a *Babel* of Religions, and dissenting judgements, in points of greatest consequence, under the mask of *one* external Communion.

§. 85. n. 10.

To μ

To [μ]. Only a *conditional* Assent, required, seems to signifie little, for establishing *unity* of Faith, or *consent* in Religion, which tyes none so, but that, of two Subscribers, one may absolutely assent, another dissent; the same person assent to day, dissent to morrow: And a *Socinian*, confident of his opinion, as freely subscribe, as any other of the *Reformed*; a *Presbyterian*, as a *Prelatist*. For, since the judgment here concerning the *condition*, [*viz.* when the Church proves what she proposeth, or when the Subscriber proves the contrary; when he is competent to search grounds, or the Church unfaithful in conserving her *Depositum*] is left, not to the *Church*, but to the *Subscriber*, it casts the *assent*, and *dissent* also wholly into his d sposal and arbitrement; and note here also, that who may require only a conditional assent, can likewise exact only, in such points as are practical, a conditional conformity; *i. e.* that none be absolutely enjoyned to practice such a thing,

but

but onely upon ſuppoſition, that the Church firſt prove it to him lawful to be done; or that he cannot prove it to the Church to be unlawful; or that he is a perſon unable to ſearch the grounds of the lawfulneſs, or unlawfulneſs thereof, &c. (of which conditio. s himſelf alſo, not the Church, is judg.) For otherwiſe; he that obligeth a perſon abſolutely to the performance of a thing, obligeth him alſo abſolutely to the believing that thing lawful to be done; which later the Church of *England* not owning, neither may ſhe the firſt; and, who ought to have his liberty for the one, ought ſo, for the other too. Now 'tis ordinary in the *Engliſh* Canons to require, upon pain of Excommunication, conformity to her Conſtitutions, where, had this ſecret been known to the *Preſbyterians*, that it is underſtood onely of *ſuch* a *conditional* conformity, I ſuppoſe there would have been no cauſe of their forbearing ſubſcription, or complaining of the *Engliſh* Church-Laws their being as rigorous, and unjuſt, as thoſe of *Rome*.

Thus I have made a ſearch into the obedience, which §. 85. n. 11.
is required of her Subjects by a Church, that ſeems not well grounded in her authority; by reaſon that, having disjoyned herſelf from that which ſhe acknowledgeth was formerly the Catholick Church, and from Superior Councils, ſhe can neither lay claim to that *Infallibility in neceſſaries*, which, from our Lords perpetual ſuperintendency, reſides in the *whole*, (as all members, throughly conſenting with the whole, and guided by it, do lay claim to ſuch Infallibility; and therefore do require obedience from their Subjects, in the ſame manner as the *whole* doth, as to all ſuch doctrines, wherein they agree with the *whole*); nor can ſhe, ſtanding apart, and alledging the reaſon of it the former Churches errors, have the confidence to claim a new Infallibility to herſelf: and therefore it is no wonder, if there ſeem ſome uncertainty, what obedience ſhe requireth; where there is, what authority ſhe poſſeſſeth; and where ſuch obedience is grounded rather on the pretended clear evidence of the *matter propoſed*, than the ſoveraign, and undeclinable authority of the *Propoſer*. Meanwhile, whe- §. 85. n. 12.
ther ſhe challengeth an obedience of aſſent from her Subjects, or that of non-contradiction, I ſee not, how ſhe can be juſtified by the *Laws* of the *Church*, or by her own *Principles*. For,
1ſt. By the *Laws* of the *Church*, if ſhe juſtly require *aſſent* from her Inferiors, might not her Superiors demand the ſame from her; and was ſhe not in conſcience obliged to yield it? Theſe, as well as ſhe, determining nothing, but what they think a *clear truth*. Or can ſhe blame the *fallible Church* of *Rome*, for requiring aſſent

to her Canons, upon *Anathema*, when *she fallible* requires the same, upon *Excommunication*? For the disparities, that are made here, have been formerly answered; and any *evidence* or *certainty* Protestants pretend for those Doctrines, to which they require assent, the *Roman* Church pleads the like for hers; and so, *sub judice lis est.* Concerning this, hear Mr. *Chillingw.* † *Any thing besides Scripture, and the* plain, irrefragable, indubitable *consequences of it*, [I suppose, he means, appearing such not onely to the Church-Governors, but their Subjects; and that all the 39 Articles have not such an evidence,] *well may Protestants hold it as matter of opinion: but, as matter of Faith and Religion, neither can they, with coherence to their own grounds, believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption.* But 2^ly. If, laying *assent* aside, onely a *non-contradiction* of her Articles, or a non-affirmation that they are any way erroneous, is required, upon excommunication of the person so offending; yet neither will this be justifiable by the Laws of the Church; for no Canon of a *National* Synod can justly pronounce Excommunication on any, for affirming so many points in their Articles erroneous, as have been determined by Superior Councils, (a *General*, or a *Patriarchal* Synod) contrarily. For example: It is not lawfull for a *National* Synod in *England* to excommunicate a person for affirming their Articles erroneous in denying *Transubstantiation*; because this hath been determined affirmatively by many former *Superior* Synods, accepted by the whole *Western* Church; (as is shewed before 1. *Disc.* §. 57.) which therefore oblige Christians to the belief, and profession of it, against the Decrees of any Inferior Western Synod. Neither 2^ly. Do they seem to inflict Excommunication on every one, that *affirms* any of their Articles erroneous, without condemning their *own Principles*; because, what they say of General Councils, is as true, I suppose, for their own Synods: *viz.* That they may err *grosly* and *manifestly*; in which case, they say, one may *lawfully affirm* these Councils, in such thing, erroneous; else how can they ever be corrected? (See before §. 43, 44. *&c.*) The case, therefore, is the same, as to *their own* Synods. And then, for what, they say, a person may lawfully do, they cannot lawfully excommunicate him.

† P. 375.

§. 85. n. 13.

But if it be replyed, that their Synods challenge an obedience of non contradiction onely to what they are *certain* is truth; and therefore none may lawfully in such case contradict them, or affirm they err. 1^a. It follows, they may, upon the same terms, require *assent* also; of which they seem more

more shie. But 2ly. As theirs plead certainty, so do other Councils; whom yet they will not excuse, upon this pretence, for requiring assent, as hath been but now said. 3ly. It seems unreasonable, that a certainty, either from the sense of Scripture, necessary Deduction, former universal Tradition, or any other way, should be pretended by a particular Church in any such matters, from which a major part of Christianity, perusing the same evidences, dissents †: such as are several of the 39 Articles. † Disc. 2 §. 5.

4ly. Protestants themselves affirm; that those, who are certain of truth, yet may not require an *absolute*, but *conditional*, assent from others; who, first, know them in general to be fallible; and next, do not know, or have it not proved to them, that in this particular they dot err. See before, §. 85. n. 10. And the same they say for *non-contradiction* required; that it must be onely conditional; *i. e.* if the contrary truth to the error defined do not appear, to the Churches Subjects, necessary to be divulged. - Disc. 4 § 11, 12.

Meanwhile, it is not denied (which was also but now said) that particular Churches, or Provincial Synods, may be certain of something as Truth, where either Scripture saith it, or a necessary deduction collecteth it, or Tradition delivereth it, such, as are *Generally* undisputed and unquestioned: and may require from their Subjects an *absolute assent*, and that upon Excommunication or *Anathema*, to all such Articles of Religion, as are either defined, or otherwise agreed on, by the whole Catholick Church; and that herein they have the same *infallibility*, as the Catholick; and their Subjects are, or may be, convinced, that they are the tenents of the Church Catholick. As the Church of *England*, though otherwise fallible, may require, not a conditional, but an absolute, assent to the Articles of the *Athanasian* Creed; because she in these is infallible, if the Catholick Church be so.

Thus much said, concerning the quality of the submission required of her Sons, by the Church of *England*, to her Articles of Religion: I now proceed to the 2*d*. thing proposed before, (§. 66.) The many Difficulties and Objections urged against an Infallible Church-Authority.

CHAP. VIII.

Solutions of several Questions concerning an infallible living Guide.

1. Q. *From what we can be assured, that Councils are infallible, since neither the Texts of Scripture, the sense whereof is disputed; nor the Decree of any Council, whose erring is the thing*

questioned, can give such assurance, §. 86. 2. Q. *From whence General Councils receive their Infallibility: such promise, if made at all, being made onely to the Church diffusive; and not delegable by this Church to others: Or, if so; no such Delegation from the Universal Church appearing to have been beforehand, made to all, or any, General Council? §. 91.* 3. Q. *How the Infallibility of General Councils is necessary, or serviceable to the Church; without which Councils, the Church subsisted, for several ages, most Orthodox? §. 98.* 4. Q. *How Lawfull General Councils, which experience hath shewed to have contradicted one another, can be all Infallible? §. 100.* 5. Q. *Lawfull General Councils being supposed to be liable to error in some things; how Christians can be assured, concerning any particular point, that in it these Councils do not erre? §. 101.*

6. Q. *Whilst such Councils are supposed Infallible; How, if they should not be so, can any error of theirs be rectified? §. 102.*

7. Q. *Whether such Councils, onely when confirmed by the Pope, or all, when yet unconfirmed by Him, are infallible? §. 104.*

8. Q. *How the Popes Confirmation can any way concurr to such Councils non-erring; since, if it erred before, it doth so still, though he approve it: but, if orthodox before, it is so still, he not approving it? §. 105.* 9. Q. *In which, (the Pope, or the Council;) this Infallibility lies? For, if in one of them, the other is needless: if in Both, then either of them sufficient: such qualities being indivisible, and without integral Parts? §. 106.*

§. 86.

Solutions of *several Questions.*

AGainst a living infallible Ecclesiastical Judg of Controversies in necessary matters of Religion, asserted above in this discourse by Catholicks; and the Church Governors in a Lawfull General Council, affirmed to be so; many difficulties are urged; and some, with much subtilty; which, it seems to me, may be, with as much plainness, satisfactorily removed.

Q. 1.

† See Mr. *Stilling fl.* p. 409, 539, 558.

1ⁿ. Then, it is asked †, whence can arise a *sufficient certainty* to Christians, that lawfull General *Councils* are *infallible*? Since it cannot arise, * from the *Decree* of any *Council*; because we know not, whether Councils err in such a Decree, till this thing first be stated to us, whether they are infallible. Nor,

2ly. * From the *Scriptnre*: Because this were to make the Scripture the sole Judg of this great Controversie, which Catholicks deny to be the sole Judg of any: and, if Scripture may decide this Controversie, it may as well all others: for that it is evident, that there are no places of Scripture, whose sense is more controverted,

ted, than the sense of those urged concerning the Churches Infallibility: If therefore these may be understood, without a living, and Infallible Judg, so, as that we may be certain of their true sense; then why not all others which concern the rule of Faith, and manners, whose sense is far less disputed, than of these?

§. 87. To which I answer. 1st. That *Scripture*, though it cannot properly be a Judge to decide any dispute about its sence; yet may be a rule, *plain*, and free enough from obscurity, in its sense, there, where some corrupt and interessed judgements may question it; nor is it to be thought really ambiguous where ever disputed or controverted; and that, though the *clearness* of this *Rule* can never be pretended, or such argument, in reason, made use of on that side, where *a few* do oppose either the common *traditional* sense of former ages, or of the *much major* part of the present age; yet on the other side, the sence thereof, that is given by the *common judgment*, either of former, or present times, may be rationally urged against these few; and especially where a superior Authority requires their conformity, they ought to yeild unto it. And here see what he saith ‖ (who urgeth this) both concerning Scripture wrested by some in its sence, even in those places of it, where it is a *Rule of necessary faith and manners*; and concerning the Christians duty herein to follow the common sence, and consent of the Church. Now, that these Scriptures here spoken of (however by some of late controverted) have been alwayes understood, in the common sence of the Church, to declare a promise of *infallibility* in its Governours, for *necessaries*, appears sufficiently by the proceedings of her Councils ancient and modern; requiring, upon *Anathema*, assent to their decrees, and inserting some of them in the Creeds. Of which more by and by ‖. Here then it is denied; that Scripture, when ever controverted by a few in some age against the traditional and common sence of the Church, both in the former and present age (as the Texts concerning the Trinity are now of late by the *Socinian*) is no Rule plain, or free, enough from obscurity in the traditional sence thereof, to decide such controversie:

‖ *Still.* p. 58, 59.

‖ § 90.

§. 88. 2ly. I answer (for so much as is affirmed of such Councils; namely their infallibility in all their definitions made in necessary matters of faith:) That Protestants themselves grant a sufficient certainty, both from *Scripture*, and from *universal tradition*, that the *Church Catholick* of all ages is unerring in necessaries; and that this Church Catholick alwayes doth, and shall consist as well of a guiding and ruling Clergy, as a guided and subject Laity: And that thus far there is no controversie, concerning

evidence of Scripture, or Tradition. And next: from hence it certainly follows; that there shall be a body of Clergy for ever not erring in necessaries——And again, from this; that this Clergy, when joyned in a general assembly, or Council, and unanimously consenting, shall never err in necessaries. And then in the last place, if perhaps some smaller number of them do dissent from the rest; since the Catholick Church is alwayes but one; and is a Government at peace within it self; and constituted in a due subordination of its members in respect of one another, and also in respect of the whole; here also it *rationally* follows; that the *greater*, and *more dignified* body of this Clergy, in any *division* of some members from it, must be, of these two, that Guide whom Christians are obliged to follow, and the lesser and inferior part obliged to conform to; and therefore this, of the two, the Guide unerring. See before Disc. 2. §. 23. &c----Disc. 1. §. 18. Here then ariseth a sufficient certainty in *reason*, from the principles conceded by Protestants, of the unerring of a lawfully *general Council* in *necessaries*, without shewing the Decree of any Council for it.

§. 89. 3^ly. Setting aside any declaration of Scripture in this matter of infallibility; and supposing the Gospel had not been writ: yet both the *Teachers* of the Gospel for ever (in their general Council at least) must have been *infallible* in *necessaries*: (else, from whom, or by what other means, no Scriptures being exstant, could people have learnt the way to salvation?): And also, this their *infallible guidance* must have been *made* sufficiently *credible* to the world by the tradition constantly descending from the testimony of our *Lord*, and his *Apostles*; who confirmed this their first testimony by *Miracles*: (else, the Christian, would have been no rational, Religion). By which testimony also it was, that those first Teachers, substituted by the Apostles, had full credit with, and did beget *infallible*, and saving *faith* in, their Gentile-Auditors, before that the *Holy Scriptures* were delivered unto these Gentiles; and therefore it appears, that these *Teachers* might have been also to this day, with sufficient certainty, relyed on, in their propagating, and preserving the Christian faith among their Converts, had there been no *Scriptures* at all to have taught the same things with them; and to have born witness to their Doctrine.

Neither may it rationally be said, that the Church's possession of these *Scriptures* hath disinherited them of any part of that Authority, and belief, which, it is agreed, that they might have challenged, had there been no Scripture; but that the present Church ought still, in the same manner, to be believed by her children to

be

be infallible in all neceſſary truth, as the Apoſtles were believed to be ſo by thoſe, who heard them, and only, from ſufficiently credible witneſſes, had heard of, but had not ſeen any of, their miracles. And then; ſuppoſing firſt this their infallibility in neceſſaries to be thus made credible to us by ſufficient evidence in point of reaſon †, we are to believe them alſo, when in their *Councils*, they tell us, *that they are infallible in all neceſſaries* (if this be a truth neceſſary to be known) upon this account, becauſe they tell us ſo: As he, that once believes, that whatever is ſaid in Gods Word is true, is to believe alſo, *that Gods Word is true*, becauſe this Word ſaith ſo. Here then you ſee, that there would have been a ſufficient certainty or aſſurance to Chriſtians, deſcending by Tradition, of their being truly and infallibly guided by the Subſtitutes of our Lord to the end of the world, without the decree of any Council preſuppoſed; and had there been no holy Scriptures extant. The ſame infallible guidance therefore is now had and known ſufficiently from them, though we putting alſo the Scriptures.

† See *Stillingf.* p. 559.

§. 90.

4ly. By primitive Tradition, the *Catholick Church* in her *General Councils* hath alwayes thought her ſelf authorized to define matters of faith upon *Anathema* to diſſenters; and to put them (as thought fit) in the Church's *Creeds* with an obligation laid on all, to believe them. Now either this will imply the infallibility of theſe Councils (as they conceived) in ſuch points; or, if this be thought to argue ſomething leſs, let but the ſame priviledge ſtill be continued to the preſent Church Catholick in her Councils; and the ſame obedience yeilded by her ſubjects to her preſent definitions; and a ſufficient certainty hereof granted, *viz.* that ſuch authority ſhe hath, and ſuch duty they owe: and any further extent of infallibility I ſuppoſe will not be claimed. Here again we ſee, that tradition in the practice of Councils, without any their Decree, ſhews a ſufficient certainty of ſuch an infallibility of Councils, as is challenged.

Thus much in anſwer to this firſt Query. Where, the taking this for a Principle of Catholicks; that none can have a ſufficient certainty of any thing (either from *Scripture*, or *Church-Tradition*, grounded at firſt on *Miracles*) antecedent to the Church's authority defining it in a general Council, cauſeth in ſome Proteſtants much miſarguing in this, and ſeveral other points. But now, if we return a like Query upon themſelves, who profeſs alſo a *ſufficient certainty*, in their faith, even of thoſe points, that are in controverſie (or it ſufficeth, if they profeſs ſo much concerning any one ſuch point); and ask, whence they have ſuch *certainty*? I

ſee

see not, what rationally they can reply. For 1st. They cannot build such a certainty on any *Church-authority*, since they deny any infallibility, or sufficient certainty as to such points in the Declarations or Doctrines of this Authority, even in the supremest Collection thereof, the Councils General, present, or past.

Nor yet 2ly. on the *Scriptures*, because the true sence of them, in these points, is not only disputed (which is here urged by them as sufficient to null a certainty); but, by the much major part of Christendom, and that, after the Protestants manifesting to the world all the grounds of their persuasion, said to be clear against their new pretensions. But 3ly. Since the Gospel was dispersed in the world by Christs Substitutes, and Ministers, and a multitude of souls saved thereby, before the penning, or publishing of the *New Testament*, or *Gospel-Scriptures*; and therefore possibly might in the same manner have continued to have been dispersed to the end of the world; or for a much longer time then it was so: this Query will still sorer press them; what certainty, in such a case, they (I mean the world learning their faith from *Teachers*, without *Scripture*) could have had of their faith? Or whence? Or whether no certainty, in such case, to be had?

§. 91. *Q.* 2. ‖ See Archb *Laud* p. 228, 239.--*Stilling.* p. 515, 516, 513.

2ly. Again it is asked ‖ from whence *General Councils* should derive this their *infallibility*? Because, 1st. The divine promises of infallibility (if made to any) are made only to the *diffusive Body* of the Catholick Church. Neither can she bequeath or delegate this infallibility to her assignes in a General Council, if no such power of devolution be contained in the original Grant; nor it can be shewed, that the *maker* of the *promises* did either appoint a General Council to *represent* the *Church*, or in such representation to be *infallible*. But 2ly. Neither can it be made evident, that the universal Church *de facto*, hath either by a formal act, or by a tacit consent, devolved, either its infallibility, or its whole power, and authority on, or given any commission to, any General Council to appear in behalf of the universal Church; which *Commission* must precede the being of such a Council; and also is necessary, not only to the first, but *toties, quoties*, to every General Council: but, that the universal Church did ever agree in any such act, is utterly impossible to be demonstrated, either that it was, or could be. 3ly. Neither, suppose it had such a *delegation*, yet can this representative, upon this, lay title to our *Lords*, or to any *divine*, institution (of which there cannot be produced one tittle from Scripture, of Christs conveying over the Churches power to it, or any particular order from the Apostles con-

concerning it) but only to the *Church's*, *i. e.* humane, institution.

And, if we enquire, thus instituted, what authority it hath? *The utmost* (saith Mr. *Stillingfleet* ‖) *that can be supposed is this, That the parts of the Church* [*i. e.* such parts, whom by their delegation, and chusing of them, the persons in the Council represent] *may voluntarily consent to accept of the decrees of such a Council; and by that voluntary act, or by the supreme authority enjoyning it, such decrees may become obligatory.* Thus he. And thus I think the authority of *General Councils* is sufficiently pared. 1. Their authority only *delegative* from that Body which yet they pretend to bind by their acts; 2. None of them a *representative* of the *whole*; which neither hath, nor can, make any such representative; 3. Commissioned by some *parts* of the Church only; 4. The *promises* of divine assistance, as to infallibility, not made to *them* (if any made), but only to the whole *diffusive* Body of the Church Catholick (from whose laws, let us but take away Councils, Protestants are secure enough); 5. Nor possible by the Church diffusive to be made over, or assigned to them; 6. These not of our *Lords*, nor *Apostolical*, but only *humane*, institution; 7. Obligatory only to those parts of the Church, who voluntarily consent to accept of their Decrees. One would suspect, that *General Councils* have been no great friends to Protestantism, when they put in so many bars to keep out their Decrees from annoying the Reformation. Men seldom vilifie an Authority, that favours them.

‖ p. 510.

§. 92.

To this I answer. 1st. That the Church Governours, whenever *assembled* in *Council*, do act by the self same authority (received from our *Lord*, and from their *Divine Institution*) by which they act singly in their several charges; and that all the rest of the Church Catholick are their subjects obliged in all duty to them, as much when con-as dis-joyned. For, as Dr. *Hammond* answers the Catholick Gentleman ‖ (in clearing of himself, that his mentioning of Schism against Bishops, Metropolitans, and Primats, involved also Schism against the Councils compounded of all these) — *It is evident, that this Power, which severally belongs to these Bishops, is united in that of the Councils compounded of them; and so, the despising of that*, [the power of such Councils] *is an offense under the first sort of Schism, and a breach of the subordination to all the ranks of our Ecclesiastical Superiours.* What authority then, and whence they had it singly, they have, united. Neither is this their authority either in their several Provinces, or in their Synods, delegative, save from *Christ*, and his *Apostles*.

‖ p. 27, 28.

§. 93.

2. Next: That they are not pretended to have their in-

infallibility in necessaries, by any assignment from the Church diffusive, but, that they have it immediately from the divine promises, made principally, and primarily to them, to whom is committed the feeding of our Lords sheep for ever, and the guiding them in the right way, of which see Disc. 1. §. 7. 14. and that the Church diffusive is therefore unerring for ever in necessaries, because these Guides are so; and the reason, why the gates of Hell cannot prevail against the *Church*, the *building*, is, because, in the chief place, they shall not prevail against these *Pastors*, and *Teachers*, the *Rocks*, and *Foundations*, whereon it is built. And, if such promise made primarily to *them*; then surely made to them in this their most comprehensive capacity, when all *joyned together*: If, at any time, the Church, in the Acts ||, might use the stile [*Visum est Spiritui sancto, & nobis*] then in their general assembly; and when they were *collecti in unum* ||, every smaller meeting of them, or also every single person, seeming muchless capable thereof; and if this inerrability necessary to them in any manner at all, most necessary in these highest Courts, to which ultimately all others do appeal, and whose Laws all are bound to obey. See before §. 8.

|| cap. 15 28.

|| vers 25.

§. 94. 3^ly. As to the *convening* and *composure* of this conjunct Judicature of the *Clergy*; I answer 1st. That these *Church Governours* are, by our *Lord's*, and *Apostolical* constitution, placed in a due *subordination* one to another †; and several Superiours indued with power to assemble them, in greater, or lesser *Bodies*, as the business requires, and times permit; these Superiors being sometimes assisted herein by the secular powers, as in the times after *Constantine*; yet sometimes also without them, as in the ages preceding *Constantine*; the *Diocesan* Synod being convened by the *Bishop*; *Provincial*, or *National*, by the *Metropolitan*, or *Primat*; and *General*, by the *Prime Patriarch*, and Bishop of the chief *Apostolick* See. '[For, why not an *Ecclesiastical person* have 'the right of calling a *General Council*, as well as the *Metropolitan* 'of a *Provincial* Synod, the *Primat* of a *National*, and (as Dr. *Field* 'ascends higher) the *Patriarch* of a *Patriarchal*?——'*For it is evident* '(saith he †) *that there is a power in Bishops, Metropolitans, Primates,* '*and Patriarchs, to call Episcopal, Provincial, National and Patriar-*'*chal Synods* [yet the last of which consisteth of the Bishops *living* '*under the temporal Government of several Princes*]: *and that neither* '*so depending of, and subject to the power of Princes; but that, when they* '*are enemies to the faith* [I add by the same reason, or enemies to 'the *Orthodox* faith] *they may exercise the same without their consent,* '*or privity; and may subject them, that refuse to obey their summons, to* '*such punishments, as the Canons of the Church do prescribe in cases of*

† See Disc 2. §. 23, 24.

† p. 668. & p. 518.

'*such*

'*such contempt, or wilful negligence.*' Thus he.] 2. Next. That these *conjunct Proceedings*, and Judicature, of the Church-Guides in greater causes do appear also to be sufficienly allowed, and authorized by our *Lord*, and his *Apostles*, both * from those Texts which mention, and refer to, a conjunct authority; as from *Mat.* 18. 17. *tell the Church*—which signifies a presence, of more than one of those, who were to judge— and from verse 20. *When two or three are gathered together in my name.* [i. e. by my authority for Judicature, as appears by the context, vers. 18. *their binding*, and *loosing* (from which the *Council* of *Chalced.*† gathers, a *minori ad majus*, the authority of more general assemblies) - and from 1 *Cor.* 5. 14, 15. *When ye are gathered together*: [i. e. the Clergy chiefly, Excommunication being an Act only of the Clergy of *Corinth*]. And also *from the *Example* in the *Acts*; where, upon the first great controverfie a Council was called to consider it; in which, though there was much disputing† (as useth to be in other Councils) yet the *conclusion* made therein, was injoyned to the *whole* Church not only by, or in, the name of the *Apostles*, but of the *whole Council*; and was injoyned by these, as assisted by that infallible holy Ghost (*vers.* 28.) by which holy Ghost also they are said to be constituted *Governors of the Church*, *Act.* 20. 28. And S. *Paul* afterward, every where, in his perambulations, delivered the decrees of this Council to be observed, *Act.* 16. 4. And lastly, * from the *pattern* (established by God, *Deut.* 17.) of the *former Church* under the Old Testament (which pattern that of the Gospel generally followeth): whose chiefest Court for deciding Controversies was a *Consistory*, or *Council*; which also we find, in the four Gospels, and in the *Acts*, to be called upon all greater occasions.

† In their Epistle to *Leo*, &c. See *Celestins Epist. ad Concil. Ephesin.*

† Act 15 6, 7.

§. 95.

4ly. That, in this meeting, though all these Governors (I mean the Bishops) who succeeded the Apostles in the chief ruling of the Church, have right, and also are obliged in duty to their Superiors, summoning them (greater inconveniencies not hindering), to be present: yet, the Churches of God having perpetual need of the residency of several of them, Hence it is, that, as some of these successors of the Apostles personally sit in the Council, and act there upon no other delegated authority save their own, held from Christ; so others are only there *represented* by their fellows, who are many times deputed also by them in their necessary absence to declare their sentiments, and vote, in matters of present debate in their stead: In respect of these absent Prelats then it is, as to any power of *deciding truths*, or *making Laws*, that this *Body* is called a *representative*, and not in respect of the

multitude, that is subject to their Orders, and obliged to receive their commands; And called a Representative of these absent Church-Colleagues, not so, as if this Body, residing in the Council, had no authority, but held from them, (the authority of both being equal); or, as if they needed, for their own Session there, any *Commission*, or warrant from the rest, when as indeed the absents need rather a *Dispensation* from them, where all, being lawfully summoned by their spiritual Superiors, out of the duty they owe to them, ought to be present, and for absence are liable to their mulcts; but only, as is said, for that several of them are deputed by these absents to present their vote and judgement in the things consulted on, which necessary occasions hinder them from delivering, there, themselves.

§. 96. 5ly. That, seeing this *Collection* of *Prelats*, especially in later times, if we take the greatest that hath, or morally can be, amounteth but to a small number in comparison of the whole Body of Prelats of the whole *Universe*, therefore the resolutions of the absent, concerning matters to be defined, are declared either in *Provincial*, or other lesser meetings, before such Council; or, the things defined (which gives less trouble,) are afterward by them ratified, and accepted, at least so far as to a *tacit consent*, or *non-contradiction* of the *Acts* of such Council of them conven'd, whereby those *Acts* become most firm, and universally obliging. Where it is also to be noted, * That the prudence of the Bishops residing in such Councils, though they have not, antecedently, the formal consent of their Brethren remaining in the Provinces for every thing they define, yet doth usually take care to regulate their definitions according to the common, clear, known, *Tradition* of the Church Doctors, both of former, and present times; (present, and former *Tradition*, as well for the sence of Scriptures, as for other things not mentioned in Scripture, being the great director of their proceedings, according the ancient Rule of Pope *Steven*, *nihil innovetur*). *Tradition*, I say, either of the *Conclusion* it self that is decided; or of the *Principles*, whence it is clearly deduced; and * that they do abstain from determining any thing, wherein they know Catholick Divines are much divided; & where any doubt is of a concurrence therein, of either all, or most, of their absent Colleagues: This division of judgments hinting to them, both that there is more obscurity, and uncertainty of the *Truth* of such Point; and less necessity of its being known; and they generally apprehend themselves only to be *Guardians* of the current *Tradition*, not *discoverers* of any new *Science*. And such a proceeding Mr. *Stillingfleet* observes in the *Fathers* of the Council of *Trent*, where

where he (transforming their Christian wisdom into humane subtilty, and guilty fear) saith † —*That by this Council much care was taken, in many of its decrees, to pass them in such general terms, that each party might find their sence in them; and that they were fearful of declaring themselves, for fear of disobliging a particular party.* Thus he. Which, drawn in fairer colours, is only to say: That this Council, without descending to a compliance with particular opinions, in its decrees established only those doctrines, which were generally delivered, and agreed on, by the learned of those Churches, which they there represented. † p. 512.

§. 97.

6ly. Yet, that this ratification of absent Ecclesiastical Governors is not held necessary as to all particular persons, or Churches (for neither, had all these absents been present in the Council, is the vote of every one there necessary for passing an Act;) or further, than a moderately major part of them. To which major part joyned with the See Apostolick, as in the Council, so by the same reason out of the Council, the rest of Prelats, and Churches are obliged to conform, in their judgment, and in the--*Idem sapientes; idipsum sentientes, in eâdem permanentes regulâ; non prudentes apud semetipsos*, which is so often inculcated by the Apostle †; that there may be no Schism, but eternal unity, and peace, in this Catholick Body; as for the remainder of the Church diffusive, (the Laity, or also some degrees of inferior clergy;) as they have no authority to sit here, as members, so neither have they to confirm, or refuse the acts of this supreme Court; but are tyed with an *obedite, & subjacere præpositis.* Heb. 13. 17. to submit to their decrees, and obey their injunctions to such a degree, as they are required. † Philip. 2. 3. 3. 16. Rom. 12. 16.

And thus do vanish those fancies—'*Of every General Council's receiving a Commission (to make its meeting authentick) from some formal act, or tacit consent of the* Church diffusive: *of the assistance of infallibility (if any had) to be made over to it by assignment from the Church diffusive; of its acting, not by any divine right, but only humane delegation; and of the several parts of the Church being obliged to its decrees, by their choice, and consent only, not upon necessity.*

Q. 3. §. 98.

3ly. Again: It is asked: how such an *Ecclesiastical infallibility* as is placed in a General Council, can be said to be serviceable, or at least necessary, to the Church; which subsisted, for the first 300. years, without any such infallible Guide? And it is asked also; by what *infallible Guide*, in the long intervals of these Councils, Christians are secured?

§. 99. To the first I answer; That this infallibility is to be supposed to accompany this Body of the Clergy taken *collectively*, not only when met in a General Council, but out of it, whenever, and however they shall manifest a *concurrence* in their *judgment*, and agreement in their doctrines; whether by several *Provincial Councils* assembled; or some one Provincial Council assembled, confirmed by the See Apostolick, and allowed by other co-ordinate Churches; or by communicatory letters of Churches to one another, in the intervals of greater meetings; and thus was infallibility resident, and preserved in the Guides of the Church, for the first 300. years. Of this matter thus Mr. *Thorndike* † (speaking of the times before *Constantine*) —*The daily intercourse, intelligence, and correspondence between Churches, without those Assemblies of Representatives we call Councils, was a thing so visibly practised by the Catholick Church from the beginning, that thereupon, I conceive, it may be called a standing Council, in regard of the continual setling of troubles arising in some part, and tending to question the peace of the whole, by the consent of other Churches concerned,* [which setlement was] *had and obtained by means of this mutual intelligence, and correspondence. The holding of Councils being a way of far greater dispatch; but the express consent of Churches, obtained upon the place, being a more certain foundation of peace,* &c. Thus he. And see what is said before *Disc.* 1. §. 18.

† Epilog. 1 l c. 3 p. 54.

To the second. That, in the intervals of Councils, if any *new* error, dangerous to the faith, and condemned by no former General Council, doth molest the Church, she, by some of the forenamed wayes, wherein she is unerrable, if there be no convenience of assembling a General Council, suppresseth it; but if an error *formerly condemned*, and crushed by a general Council, begin to exalt it self, and grow again; that there needeth no more to quiet it, than that the present Church Governours do put in execution the former *unerring* decrees of those Councils.

Q. 4. §. 100. 4ly. Again it is asked: How lawful General Councils can be maintained *all* unerring, which Councils experience hath shewed to have contradicted one another?

To which I answer: That he, who saith so, either takes some Council to be a lawful General one, that is not so in the judgment of the present Church Catholick, as stated before §. 11, 12. & 2. Disc. §. 23. &c. Or takes some of their definitions to contradict, which do not so, in the judgment of the present Church Catholick. Or urgeth things in some ages commonly received, or practised (in which there is a great latitude,) as things then de-

defined. But, if the judgment of the Church in these ought to be preferred before some private members thereof, she denies such contradiction in matters of faith to be in any of the General Councils, that she receives.

5ly. Again it is asked: If a *General Council* should err in the defining of something *not necessary*; and again, if it can be proved, that no exact distinction can be made of such from *necessaries*, how any Christian can be secure, for any particular point of his faith, that both such Council, and himself, do not err in it? Q. 5. §. 101.

I answer. 1st. That, if what is supposed should be granted, yet still is such Christian, as believes all the Council proposeth, secure, that his faith is deficient in nothing necessary. And, that Protestants think the like security sufficient in their own faith. For they holding the sence of Scripture clear even to the unlearned in all necessaries, and believing all the Scripture saith, though they cannot exactly distinguish necessary points therein from others, yet affirm their faith to be secure, because actually not erring in any point clear, and so also, not in any point necessary. 2ly. That, as to the *Principal* points of faith called necessary, they are both, by Councils, sufficiently discerned from non-necessaries; and proposed as necessaries; and so by Christians believed as such: In these particulars, therefore, they are certain of their not erring; and, as to other points of their faith, that it is sufficient for Christians to know; that, if necesiary, they do not err in them; though, which in particular are *necessary*, and so certainly not erred in, they know not. But meanwhile, do those, who urge, thus, an uncertainty in the faith of Catholicks in attaching their judgment to *Councils*, which in *not necessaries* are supyosed liable to error, make (themselves) any better provision for the *Protestants faith*, in remitting them, from Councils, unto their own judgments; which, in necessaries also, they grant, are liable to error; at least, upon their, not using due industry, their being swayed by passion, interest, &c. which every humble man, surely, will suspect himself of sooner, than a Council?

6ly. Again. It is much pressed; That, upon the pretence, that a *General Council* is *infallible*, no *error* of such *Council* can ever be corrected, or remedied, neither by a particular person or Church; or yet by another Council General. Q. 6. §. 102.

I answer: If the Council be, as it is pretended, infallible, no need of correcting an error, where is none. If it be fallible;

lible; yet if so, only in non-necessaries; no great harm, if Christians in such a point be misled; but great, if, private men throwing off this Guide upon such pretence, they should so come in some *necessary* point to miscarry. But indeed, for General Councils to be fallible in necessaries also, this I grant would be a thing most mischeivous to the Church: but, that they shall never thus err, see what is said before §. 6. & Disc. 1. §. 7. 14. And indeed, the objection here, *i. e.* the ruine, which such error would bring upon Christianity, (considering the obedience commanded to these Councils) is a sufficient Argument, that thus they never err; nor consequently need reformation.

§. 103. But meanwhile those, who urge this, that the *error* of a General Council, in an universal obligation of belief to it, can never be *rectified*, or reformed, consider not; That, on the other side, in admitting a reformation of any its supposed errors, no *truth* can be *established*; and that, before one error will so be amended; many truths, whilst its definitions are exposed to the trial of every private fancy, will be perverted; and that it is much the better of the two, that some error [in *non-necessaries*] remain unremedied, than that no truth [in *necessaries*] stand fixed, and confirmed. Again, since all persons, for the truth of such things wherein the sence of Scripture is controverted, if they will not profess themselves Scepticks, ought to acquiesce in some ultimate Judge, or other, though liable to error; let those then, who reject a General Council, name what other ultimate Judge they will chuse, rather. I suppose, here, they will blush to name *themselves* for that Judge; neither can they have shew of reason to name either any other *single* person, or yet *inferior* Council to be that Judge, against a *General*. Lastly. The same difficulty and hazard may be charged upon the Protestant's ground of the certainty of his faith † *viz. That the sence of holy Scripture is clear to all using ordinary industry to understand it, in all necessaries.* For now supposing, that indeed the sence of Scripture should not be clear, and so such Protestant (solely guided by it) using his industry yet should err, in some such point; such error of his is no way to be rectified, so long as he maintains this ground. A thing observed by Mr. *Thorndike, Just Weights*, c. 21. p. 137.

† See Disc. 2. § 38.

Q. 7. §. 104. 7ly. Again it is asked: whether a lawful General Council be affirmed infallible only with, or also without the concurrence and confirmation of its decrees by the *Bishop of Rome?*

To which (waving here, what testimony may be produced from Scripture, and the Exposition of Antiquity, concern-

ing

ing St. *Peters* ſupremacy, and the Biſhop of *Rome's* ſucceeding in it).

1ſt. I anſwer in the words of the Apoſtle † (ſtanding upon the *Church's cuſtom*) in another matter: That the *Churches of God* always have had ſuch a *cuſtom* to define nothing in faith without, or againſt, the conſent of this Succeſſor of *Saint Peter*, and Biſhop of the prime *Apoſtolick* See; and that this hath been conſtantly delivered by their Tradition. See the ancient Canon concerning this [*Sine Romano Pontifice nihil finiendum*]; *urged by *Julius* not long after the Council of *Nice* (in his Epiſtle recited by *Athanaſius Apol.* 2.) againſt the Oriental Arrian Biſhops ſlighting his authority; * urged by *Innocentius* (*apud Auguſt.* Ep. 91.): * mentioned by *Socrates* l. 2. c. 13---by *Sozomen*, l. 3. c. 9. And it is remarkable, that in the times, that thoſe, acknowledged by all, capital errors (ſuppreſſed in the *Athanaſian* Creed) troubled the Church, though all the other chief Patriarchs were tainted with one or other of them; yet the Biſhop of *Rome* always ſtood firm, and the Church, in her vote, always joyned with his Chair, though divided from ſome of the other. If the Act of *Liberius* be here objected, ſee what is anſwered to it. Diſc. 2. §. 26 n. 4. And, ſeeing this Prime Patriarch of the Church Catholick preſides in *General Councils* †, as the Metropolitan doth in *Provincial*, therefore, as the *Canons* ordered concerning *Provincial* Councils — *Ut nihil præter* Metropolitani *conſcientiam gerant, &c. ſic enim unanimitas erit* †: ſo there ſeems the ſame equity, that neither the *General Councils* ſhould paſs any acts without the conſent of the *Roman* Biſhop, their Preſident, and Head. But 2ly. So long as no Councils are preſſed upon Proteſtants, as lawfully general, or infallible, ſave only ſuch, which this Prime Patriarch hath always conſented to, and confirmed, this queſtion, whether the Acts of ſuch Councils may ſtand good, or their authority be infallible, without his conſent may be ſuperſeded.

† 1 *Cor.* 11. 16.

† *See before* §. 33.

† *Apoſtol. can.* 35. *Concil. Antioch. can.* 9.

Q. 8. §. 105.

8. Again; it is asked: How the *Pope's Confirmation* of its decrees can concur to the *not erring* of ſuch a Council, ſince his Confirmation follows its final deciſion? For now, if it hath erred, it is erroneous, though he approves it; if not, it is Orthodox [and ſo may be ſafely accepted] though he rejects it †.

I anſwer; his *Confirmation* ſecures us, that the *Council* errs not, (or the Council never errs, when he confirms it); becauſe, ſuppoſing that the reſt of the Council ſhould decree an error, the Grace of God, or the *Holy Ghoſt* aſſiſts this holy Father, and Prime Patriarch of the Church Catholick, Preſident of theſe Councils ſo, as that it effectually hinders him (after what manner, or by what

† Dr. *Pierce* Anſw. to *Creſſy* p. 17. — *Stillingf.* p. 509.

means it pleaseth) that he doth never confirm it, least so the whole Church should be misguided in something necessary. Or again, when he perhaps would (left to himself) confirm an error, the same *Holy Spirit* assists the Council so, (by what wayes of the divine wisdom it matters not) that they do not define it. And thus the Council never erreth, being confirmed by him; either, because its decree is Orthodox; or, his consent with-held. Hence then, if the decrees be erroneous, he never approves; if Orthodox, he safely approves them.

Q. 9. §. 106. 9. Again it is asked; if the *Council* not secure from erring without the *Pope's* approbation; nor again, the *Pope* without the assistance of a *Council*, in which of the *two* the infallibility, or not erring, resides? For, in which soever we shall place it, it renders the other needless.

I answer: where is supposed the consent of both in a truth, the actual non-erring lies in both: But the Original cause of this not erring may be sometimes in the one, and sometimes in the other, (as also erring may be in either, separated) as they are by the holy Ghost more effectually illuminated, or guided so, as in the last question is explained.

CHAP. IX.

10. *Q. If General Councils infallible; whether they are so in their conclusions only? which infers Enthusiasm, or new Revelation. Or also in their premises and proofs? upon which, assent will be due to all their Arguments.* §. 107. 11 *Q. Why, being infallible at least in their conclusions, they do not end all controversie, but leave so many unresolved?* §. 108. 12. *Q. How such infallibility of theirs differs from that of the Apostles? And the infallibility of their Decrees, from that of Scripture?* 109. 13. *Q. How many persons, or Guides, all fallible, can make up one infallible?* §. 112. 14. *Q. Supposing all lawful General Conncils infallible; yet, how can any know infallibly, which are lawful General Councils? Because of the many conditions required to make them such; in some one of which, he can never be infallibly certain of any Council, that it hath not failed.* §. 114.

10. AGain; it is asked: If a lawful General Council be not liable to error, whether it is so, in its

De-

Definitions, and *Concluſions* only, or in the *Premiſes* alſo, and its *right deduction* of the Concluſion from them?

I anſwer; That it is not neceſſary, that it ſhould be free from error, ſave in the Definition, or concluſion only; [which I ſay, not, as denying *ſufficient* former *Revelation*, and *Tradition*, whereon to ground every concluſion, that hath been paſſed in any Council: nor, that ſuch Revelation, and Tradition is unknown to the Council; but only, that, for the Councils not erring in the Concluſion, this is not neceſſary, that *all* the Principles, or *all* the reaſoning it uſeth, be infallible, and certain. If it be asked; how it is poſſible, that the Council ſhould be infallible, or actually unerring, (for this is all that is meant), in the *Concluſion*, when fallible, or erring in the making *Premiſes*, or *deduction*? I anſwer: Becauſe the Holy Ghoſt aſſiſts them that they ſhould alwayes conclude right, and that, from ſome principles never failing. Though ſome other principle or Reaſon, whereby they go about to prove, or confirm ſuch a concluſion, be not ſolid. I ſay *ſome* principle, for, ſince the ſame concluſion is provable by *many* ſeveral *Mediums*, or Arguments; or the Concluſion, or Definition it ſelf may deſcend by expreſs Tradition, and not be extracted only out of ſome former traditive Principle by deduction, it cannot be ſhewed, that any Council hitherto hath *failed* in *either* of theſe, the delivering a propoſition as expreſs Tradition, that was not ſo, or the deducting it from principles, *none* of which are *true*, or *Traditional*. Nor are we certain, that more *Arguments*, or *Reaſons* were not uſed by any ſuch Council, than thoſe only, that are tranſmitted to poſterity. Nor do I ſee, who are ſufficient Judges of the miſarguings of Councils, unleſs it be ſome following Council of the ſame Authority. It cannot be denied alſo, that the Holy Ghoſt may preſerve the Church in all neceſſary Truth, by inſpiring and illuminating their underſtandings in, and exciting the adherence of their will to ſuch Truth, when they are miſtaken in ſome of the rational evidence they think they have for it. By *illuminating them*, I ſay, after the ſame ordinary manner in the Council; as them, or others, out of it: only this aſſiſtance, here, is *conſtant*, to a competent number, (and they are *diſpoſed rightly* for it) in this ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical Court, for the *neceſſities* of the Church; whereas, out of the Council, the ſame perſons, when, ſome way indiſpoſed thereto, often fail of it. But in the laſt place, if it be asked; how *they*, or *others* can *know*, that that they do not err in the Concluſion, where their premiſes, or their deduction is ſuppoſed erroneous? I anſwer; 1ſt. That they may know they do not err, either from Tradition of the Concluſion, or the certainty of other premiſes, or evident deduction uſed.

2ly. That, indeed, they cannot truly be *certain* of their concluſion by this way, *viz.* from their *arguing*, if it be not right; or from the *Principle* they uſe, if this uncertain, or falſe; but yet they may be certain of their Concluſion ſtill by another way from Chriſts promiſes, if he hath ingaged to them a not erring therein; and the confidence of their infallibility lies in this latter, not alwayes the former, which perhaps may be diſcovered ſometimes to fail: In the firſt Council (Act. 15.) there was much reaſoning *pro*, and *con* (v. 15.) and ſome reaſoning that was amiſs; and yet to their Concluſion was prefixt a —*Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto*.

Q. 11. §. 108.

11. Again it is asked: Why, if theſe Councils ſecure of not erring, at leaſt in their Concluſions, they do not ſtraightwayes determine all Controverſies, ſome of which ſeem neceſſary to be ſo determined, becauſe of the great trouble they give the Church? and particularly; why the Council of *Trent* left ſo many unreſolved, that were agitated not only before, but alſo in that Council, by its own members?

I anſwer, Becauſe they have a promiſe of divine aſſiſtance, not in deciding *any* point controverted, but only thoſe *neceſſary*. And, again, they judge neceſſary to be decided only thoſe points, whereof they have a former *Revelation*, and *Tradition* deſcended to them (for, in all neceſſaries, by the divine providence, theſe two fail them not); a *Revelation*, and *Tradition* thereof either in the formal *Concluſion* it ſelf, or in its neceſſary *Principles*. In the conſidering of which Principles, and deductions, though the Guides are ſometimes liable to miſtakes; yet the divine promiſe, and ſuperintendency * never ſuffers them to err in the matter that is concluded from them, or alſo never ſuffers them to err in *all* thoſe principles (when they attempt by theſe to prove ſome tradition) from which it may be concluded, (as is mentioned in the laſt Query), whilſt they paſs not beyond the ſetling of thoſe doctrines, which are neceſſary for the edification of this Church; *nor yet 2ly. ſuffers them to paſs theſe bounds of reſolving neceſſaries; ſo far as to burden the Church's *faith* with curioſities. And this union of the divine direction, together with humane reaſoning, may be obſerved in the very firſt Council held *Act.* 15. but now mentioned. Where the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt is applyed to all or major part that ſate in Council, and concurred in making the decree, not only to the Apoſtles; and is found well to conſiſt with the great reaſoning, & diſputing uſed there before the laſt reſolution—*Cum autem magna conquiſitio fieret* Vers. 7.—And yet—*Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis.* Vers. 28.

There

There are therefore two ſorts of Controverſies, which theſe ſupreme Courts ordinarily diſmiſs unreſolved: the one ſort out of neceſſity: namely thoſe, whereof they find no certain former *Revelation*, or *Tradition*: whence, with good reaſon, they conclude alſo the *knowledge* of them not neceſſary: the other voluntarily: ſuch as appear to them of *ſufficient evidence*, but *ſmall conſequence*.

12. Again; it is asked: How ſuch infallibility of lawful *General Councils* doth any way differ from that of the *Apoſtles*? or that of their *decrees*, from the holy *Scriptures*? Q. 12. §. 109.

I anſwer: That whatever decrees of Councils are true, they are as true, as the Scriptures; and in whatever the Church-Guides are infallible or unerring, they are as infallible in it, as the Apoſtles (for one truth is no truer, than another): but that this their infallibility, as to ſeveral circumſtances thereof, compared with the Apoſtles, is much inferior.

1ſt. In that it is not extended ſo far for its matter, as that of the Apoſtles; they being infallible in *all* they delivered, theſe only in their *Concluſions*, or *Definitions*.

2ly. In that, though ſometimes the reaſon, why theſe do not err in ſuch a Definition, may be, not their neceſſary deduction of it from an infallible Principle, but the inſpiration, illumination, immediate aſſent of faith, or ſome other way of operation of God's Spirit at that time, upon them, in ſuch manner, as it works on other Chriſtians, when ever it opens their minds, and makes them underſtand a truth beyond the rational arguments they have, or humane induſtry they uſe, to attain it: yet ſuch *inſpiration* in this differs from that of the Apoſtles; that, as the Council collects not this their infallibility from any unfailable argumentations, alwayes made by them concerning ſuch particular Concluſion; ſo neither do they collect it from any ſuch inſpiration, which they *ſenſibly* p. rceive; nor from any expreſs *teſtimony*, that the Spirit g ves to ſuch its operation, as the Apoſtles did; but only, in general, from the *Divine Promiſe*, that in all ſuch *Concluſions* they ſhall not miſcarry. §. 110.

3ly. The Church's infallibility differs from the Apoſtolical, in that it is an inſpiration, or revelation (if you will) not of any new Doctrine, but of ſuch, as was, in its principles at leaſt, formerly revealed, and delivered by Chriſt or his Apoſtles; and therefore the knowledge thereof, (if at any time it was not), might be, attained by deduction from thoſe Principles, without any new inſpiration, and is actually had in the Church ſtill, either from ſuch §. 111.

true Principle, or by *Tradition* of the Concluſion it ſelf. And, to end this queſtion; let them, who ask it, conſider: in what manner the Church Catholick diffuſive is for ever preſerved infallible in neceſſaries (a thing they affirm) without its equalling infallibility Apoſtolical. And I anſwer: her General Councils are ſo too. To the other part of the Query, I anſwer; In what ſort, their infallibility equals not the Apoſtles, ſo neither that of their decrees, that of Scripture.

Q. 13. §. 112.

† Dr. *Pierce* Anſw. to *Creſſy* p. 9.

13. Again; it is asked: † How many perſons, or Guides, all *fallible*, can make up one *infallible*; any more than many Planets one Sun; or many acts of finite knowledge, one, truly infinite? I anſwer 1ſt. with another queſtion: How the *whole diffuſive Body* of the Church, conſiſting of many members all fallible, or failable in neceſſaries, yet is affirmed by Proteſtants, that it ſhall be for ever infallible, or unfailable in neceſſaries? 2ly. *Infallible* being underſtood, as it is meant; *i. e.* for the Church *actually never erring*, at ſuch *time*; in ſuch a *meeting*; and treating on ſuch *matters*; the queſtion is no more than this: How ſeveral perſons erring in one thing, may be non-erring in any, or in another, thing? Or how the ſame perſons, when met together, and divinely aſſiſted in the matters they conſult about, do not, or ſhall not err, when the ſame perſons in the ſame things, at ſome other time, when not conſulting together, and having no certain divine aſſiſtance promiſed to them, may, and ordinarily do err? And it is anſwered, that this is effected by the good pleaſure of God divinely aſſiſting and preſerving them in ſuch meeting, in ſuch matters, from error.

† Dr. *Pierce* *Ib.* p. 11.

It is alſo urged †; That Councils indeed may actually not err (as ſingle perſons alſo may not); yet that hence none can rightly ſtile Councils infallible, or unerrable; and that there is a great difference between the Participle [ſuppoſe *non fallens*, or *non falſus*] and the Adjective in *bilis* [*non fallibilis*] I anſwer; whatever difference there be between Participles, and Adjectives; no more is here meant by the ſecond, than by the firſt, only with a *ſemper* added to it, *viz. Eccleſia infallibilis, i. e. ſemper non falſa* [if I may uſe this word]: *in errabilis, i. e. ſemper non errans*; or *de facto nunquam errans*. Now, though particular members of the Church are alſo unerring in ſeveral things, yet not alwayes; and though this, that God may preſerve ſingle perſons unerring alwayes, is true; yet that he doth ſo, is denied of them, but affirmed of the Church, or lawful General Council, as to all neceſſaries. Is it not ſtrange, that grave Divines (rather than be found without a reply) ſhould raiſe miſts, and make great difficulties, and fall on vindicating the divine

divine Attributes, in such a matter as this, intelligible to children? who, one day, must give account hereof.

§. 113.

After all these objections, and difficulties, made concerning the *infallibility*, or not erring of *lawful General Councils*. Next, supposing, that all such are, as to all necessary faith, an infallible Guide; and all the former difficulties concerning this point clearly removed: yet a new roll of objections, and interrogations is brought in against our discerning, or knowing certainly, *what*, or *how many* of *past Councils* have been *lawfully General*.

Q. 14. §. 114. 14. Next then it is urged; That, *lawful General Councils* only being pretended *infallible*. Any, to be certain of any particular Council its not erring, and so to yeild his assent to its decrees as such, must know first; whether it is a *lawful General Council*. And for this again; must know: who are justly the constitutive members of such a body? * whether *Bishops* only, or also *Presbyters*, or also the *Laity*, (as, *Act.* 15. 22,23. *the Brethren* also are admitted)? * whether the votes therein ought to be numbred according to the *persons*, or rather to the several *Churches*, and *Nations*; the greater Churches having many times in the Synod the fewer representatives, and so the fewer personal votes? * whether the Bishops sitting therein were *lawful* Bishops? and, in order to this, whether 1st. truly *Priests*, and truly *baptized*? and whether that some of these Sacraments had no miscarriage, for want of the Priests due intention in administring them? * whether a *sufficient number* of Bishops residing in it, and those equally from all parts, so to make it a full and entire representative of the Church Catholick? and * whether the *Pope's summons* be sufficient thereto? [though this question seems needlesly asked for all those Councils, in the convening of which both the Pope, & Christian Princes have concurred]* 1. whether the Bishops appearing in Council were *sufficiently commissioned* from those Churches they pretend to represent? and 2. * whether *sufficiently instructed*, as to the points to be decided, concerning the sence therein of the absent Bishops first declared in their *Provincial*, or other, *Synods*, or meetings? and 3. * whether those in the Council did *truly speak*, and render this their sence? * whether, being lawfully assembled, they have also *lawfully proceeded*? * whether they came to the Council *without prejudice*, and sought nothing but the truth (otherwise they are not gathered together in *Christ's name*; and then, neither is he in the midst of them)? whether a *faction*, or some few (more powerful) have not *out-witted*, or *over-awed* the rest? and * whether some, not *corrupted*, or *bribed* to give their vote against

against conscience? * whether, being lawfully assembled, and lawfully proceeding, they *made* indeed *such decrees*, as are pretended theirs? * what of these decrees are *de fide*, what not? * whether these decrees have that *meaning* really, which the peruser of them apprehends? for, *Scriptures*, in deciding of Controversies, being doubtful, and liable to wrong interpretations, why may not the *decrees* of *Councils* be so too? *Nay much more? for we have many other places to compare, the help of original tongues, and the help of the primitive Church, to understand* Scripture *by*: *when the* decrees *of* Councils *are many times purposely framed in general termes, and with ambiguous expressions to give satisfaction to some dissenting parties.* [Thus they argue; as if they should say: If the Law cannot be understood, much less the Judge that is appointed to explain it, for also we have many Comments on the Law, none on his Sentence: or, as if the *sence* of those many Canons of Councils, that are urged against Protestants, were not granted by them both *sufficiently clear*, and accused by them as *evidently erroneous*]. Lastly, * whether their decrees have been *confirmed* by the *Pope*? And then, for this, it must be known also, whether the *Pope* confirming them was a *lawful Pope*, * whether not *Simonically elected*? [which but once hapning, there follows from it the illegality of all his Successors; because these chosen by some Cardinals, that were created by him, who are no legitimate Electors; and *upon this account* (saith Mr. *Stillingfleet* †) *there hath been no legal Pope since* Sixtus *the Fifth*]. And here again return all these questions, concerning the *Pope's Baptism, Ordination*, &c. with a *right intention* of the Priest in doing them, which were asked formerly concerning the Bishops.

† *Stillingf.* p. 512.

† p. 125.

These, and many more (such like) Queries are made by persons studying acuteness in throwing down the Pillars of a former setled faith, to make way for introducing a more free, and unconfined, (*i. e.* a more sceptical, and arbitrary, or latitudinarian) *Religion*. And, since from any of these Queries a quarrel may be made against a *Council*, as not *lawful*; there will never want, for any past Council, some pretence or other, of disallowing it, when stating Doctrines, or giving Laws, contrary to our inclination, or interest, and how easie were it for a *Socinian*, from several of these, to quarrel with that of *Nice*? See below Disc. 4. §. 18. &c.

§. 115. To all which I return this answer: 1st. That a rational, *not-possibly-fallible*, certainty or assurance of the lawfulness of any Council, or of the forementioned particulars, whereby this lawfulness may be known, is by no side affirmed necessary. 2ly. That, as for a *non-morally fallible* certainty in respect of several of the particulars, [such as these, whether all the Bishops that sate in the

Council

Council of *Nice*, were truly and lawfully baptized, ordained, *&c.* none simoniacally elected, none come to the Council with prejudice, none corrupted, or over-awed in giving his vote, *&c.*] this is sufficient, that, where any of these do fail the cognizance of Tradition, yet any Christian in general may be rationally assured (I mean, as to the *much major part* of such Council, for more needs not,) that that divine providence, and assistance, which is supposed to preserve the Church's lawful General Councils from *not erring* in necessaries, doth consequently either preserve such Councils, as are taken by this Church for lawfully general, from all such *defects*, as do render them not capable of his promise of not erring: Or, if any forepassed Councils, reputed lawfully General, have had such defects, doth continue the same priviledge of *not erring* also to these Councils, because such their defects are undiscernable to the Church. Otherwise, the Church's error, in *not discerning* lawful Councils, would render the divine favour, in *assisting* lawful Councils, useless, and unbeneficial unto her.

§. 116.

And this answer is no more, than is thought reasonable, and given by Protestants in other cases. So Mr. *Chillingworth*, † up a doubt proposed; whether a *Penitent* doing his own best indeavours, when absolved of his sins, by one that goes for, but really is no Priest, or by a Priest, but without an intention of absolving him, receives any benefit thereby, thinks this a good answer: *That God's goodness will supply all such defects, as, to humane indeavours, were unavoidable. And therefore, though his Priest were indeed no Priest, yet to him he should be, as if he were one: and, if he gave absolution without intention, yet, in doing so, he should hurt himself only, not his Penitent*—And Protestants (upon supposition that God hath, by no other way, clearly revealed the points necessary to salvation) do, from the same goodness of God, prove their fundamental Doctrine; that all necessaries to salvation are clearly revealed in Scripture; where, as I conceive the supposition to fail, so the arguing good, upon the common Principle: that, *Deus non deficit in necessariis.*

† p. 78.

§. 117.

3ly. So far, as the former questions are moved concerning a sufficient certainty: I suppose Protestants will affirm; that they have a sufficient certainty concerning some Councils, that they were lawfully General: as, concerning the four first, whose Definitions also they retain in their Creed: what ground therefore of their certainty of these Councils (that they were lawfully General) they will return to a *Socinian* asking the former questions of them (whether this *ground* be a General Church-Tradition, or any thing else) the same may be returned to the same questions concern-

ing the reſt, that have been held lawfully General by the common Tradition of later times, ſince the ſitting of ſuch Councils. Add to this; that notwithſtanding, in general, they allow ſome obedience due to lawful General Councils; yet, if they deny a ſufficient certainty of knowing any ſuch, this is, in effect, to releaſe all Chriſtian obedience to any Council, in particular.

§. 118. 4ly. I anſwer: That, for ſolution of the former queſtions, ſuch as are more material (as touching the *ſufficiency* of the *repreſentative*; the *lawfulneſs* of their *proceedings*, their *Confirmation* by the See *Apoſtolick*; *acceptation* by the *Church diffuſive* (ſuch as is neceſſary) &c. private Chriſtians have ſufficient certainty from the teſtimony, that after the ſitting of ſuch Councils, the *continued Tradition* of the Church Catholick, or of its Governors, taken in the ſence explained before §. 8. 12. & Diſc. 2 §. 23. or alſo met in later Councils, delivers thereof: in which *tradition* he may ſecurely reſt, and ſuperſede that queſt, for ſatisfaction of the former doubts, with which others muſt needs be much perplexed, who have not the humility to acquieſce in the reſolutions of their forefathers.

§. 119. † §. 2. 6. 5ly. Since the Church Catholick (or its Governors as ſtated before †) of *all ages*, and therefore that of the *preſent age*, is an infallible Guide in neceſſaries; therefore, whatever former Councils, and their definitions, the preſent Church, or its Governors do accept, and own, Chriſtians may be aſſured from this, that ſuch Councils have not erred in neceſſaries; and either were lawfully general and obliging, or at leaſt by this acceptation of the preſent Church, are rendred equivalent thereto; the act of this Church, her allowing their decrees being of the ſame ſtrength, and vigor, as is her new decreeing them. And thus: for ſuch Councils, the former inquiries become fruſtrated. Note, that I underſtand the acceptation of the preſent Church Catholick, or its Governors, in the ſence explained before §. 11. &c. & Diſc. 1. §. 38.

6. But, laſtly; though a *ſufficient certainty*, by theſe wayes, a Chriſtian may have, concerning what, or how many, have been lawful General Councils, or equivalent thereto: and ſo, concerning their decrees: yet it is not affirmed by *Catholicks*; that either a non-poſſibly, or a non-morally, fallible certainty of theſe Councils, or of their Decrees or Definitions, is neceſſary to *all perſons*, for the attaining a *divine* and *ſalvifical* belief of all the neceſſary articles of their Faith. Of which ſee below §. 125. 127. Provided, that every one be rightly diſpoſed to believe; both concerning Councils, and their Decrees, what is, or ſhall be, by their Superiors ſufficiently propoſed to them; without and before which propoſal,

posal, he may be, not only not infallibly certain, but, without peril to salvation, ignorant, (supposing the common Creeds, [professed by him,] to contain all articles, that are necessary *ratione Medii* to be explicitly believed), both, what Councils are lawfully General, and what such General Councils have decreed.

CHAP. X.

15: Q. *Lastly, Catholicks pretending, a Divine Faith of the Articles of Christian Religion to be necessary to salvation; and all Divine faith necessarily to be grounded on Divine Revelation; it is asked, upon what ground a Christian, by a Divine Faith, believes all those Articles of his Faith, that are defined by particular Councils? Where, if it be said; from the testimony of the present Church, which is declared by the divine Revelation, infallible, the question proceeds; whence this testimony can be proved by divine Revelation infallible, unless it be, from God's Word (written or unwritten)? But then, such writings, for effecting a Divine Faith, cannot be proved to be God's Word, but from some other Divine Revelation (for a Divine Faith, can never ground it self save on a Divine Revelation): where also we cannot return again to the testimony of the Church, I mean as this is by Divine Revelation infallible, without making a Circle.* §. 120. *To which is answered.* 1. *That the object of a Divine Faith is alwayes in it self infallible.* §. 123. 2. *That Divine Faith alwayes resolveth it self into Divine Revelation: and that, into some one, wherein it ultimately resteth; without a process in* infinitum, *or wheeling about in a Circle.* §. 129. *n.* 1 — §. 132, 143, 144. 3, 4. *That such Divine Faith is alwayes wrought in Christians by the operation of God's Spirit.* §. 164. *n.* 2. 5, 6. *But attainable without any extrinsecal, infallible, Introductive or Proponent. Neither that it is necessary, that all men, for the enjoying a Divine, and saving Faith, be first infallibly certain, that the external proponent thereof is infallible.* §. 127. *&c.* 7. *Yet, that there are those morally-certain grounds producible for this Faith, and all the Articles thereof, as they are believed in the Catholick Church, which no other Religion besides Christianity, nor no other Sect, or seducing private spirit in Christianity, can pretend to.* §. 135. 8. *That a rational certainty, or morally-infallible ground of a Christians Faith, for this at least, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and consequently, whatever is contained therein, infallible, is affirmed by all.* §. 136. *But further: That an infallibility of the*

Church-Guides, (in neceſſaries) as clearly revealed in Scripture, and by Tradition Apoſtolical, is believed by Catholicks. From which infallibility of the Church, thus cleared to them, they retain a firm faith of all thoſe other points that are not in Scripture or Tradition, as to all men, ſo evidently revealed as Church-infallibility is. In many of which points thoſe others, who believe only infallibility of Scripture, are liable to miſcarry. §. 140. Shewed from the precedents, that no Circle is made in the Roman-Catholicks reſolution, either of a Divine, or acquiſite, Faith. §. 143. &c. The Concluſion. Wherein, of the many advantages of promoting their ſalvation loſt by Proteſtants, in perſiſting out of the Communion, and rejecting the conduct of the ſpiritual Guides, of the Roman-Catholick Church.

IN this Query which follows, concerning the Reſolution of Faith, wherein ſeveral Catholicks do variouſly expreſs themſelves (according to their liberty of opinion, unreſtrained by any former Church-definition), and many of the terms have ſuch a latitude of ſignification, as it is hard to ſpeak ſo diſtinctly, as not in ſomething to be miſunderſtood, I have purpoſely quoted ſeveral Catholick Authors of good note, in confirmation of what is delivered, to remove from you all jealouſie, that any thing is ſaid here, new, Heterodox, or formerly cenſured, by the Roman Church.

Q. 15. §. 120. 15ly. In the laſt place it is further preſſed: That a *moral certainty*, or, if you will, a *moral infallibility*, could it perhaps be ſhewed for many of thoſe things mentioned in the former queſtions, yet is not ſufficient to afford a ground of that faith, which Catholicks do require as neceſſary: For that they ſay; that a Chriſtian cannot with a *right*, and a *divine* faith, believe the particular points of his faith to be divinely revealed, unleſs he have an infallible, or not poſſibly fallible, aſſurance thereof: nor can he have ſuch infallible aſſurance, unleſs the Church's definitions in her General Councils, that deliver ſuch doctrines to be divine Revelations, be ſo infallible. Nor can he infallibly believe the definitions of any Council in particular to be ſo infallible, unleſs he be infallibly certain, that it is a *lawful General* Council (for all other *inferior* Councils, Catholicks grant, may err in their Definitions); nor can he be infallibly certain of this, unleſs he be ſo of all thoſe things too, without which, Catholicks grant, it is no General Council. And if an infallible certainty alſo of all theſe things, ſo far as it is neceſſary, ſhould be pretended from the *Tradition* of the Church, ever ſince the time of the ſitting of ſuch Councils, delivering and declaring to poſterity theſe Councils in groſs for lawfully General, becauſe this *Church-*

Tra-

Tradition is held *infallible*; It is asked again, whence this *Tradition* is infallibly known to be so; where, if it be said, from our *Lord's promises* to the Church declared in the *Scriptures*; and so the infallibility of the Church-Tradition be resolved into Divine Revelation: It is still urged; whence can any know infallibly, either in particular, that those *Texts* which are urged to make good such a promise, have such a *sence* as is pretended; or in General, that the *Scriptures*, containing such Texts, are the infallible *Word* of *God*; and here again, if we return to prove an infallible certainty of the sence of these particular Scriptures; or in general of the Scriptures being divine, from the *tradition*, and *testimony* of the Church; then here again I must make this testimony of the Church *infallible*; and the former question returns (as unsatisfied by the former answer), *viz.* whence I can prove its testimony or Tradition infallible? of which *infallibility* for me here to resume an evidence from the *Scriptures*, or from the former *Texts*, will cast my reasoning into a vicious circle.

§. 121.

But if I proceed, and say; That the Tradition of the Church may be proved sufficiently to be infallible from the *motives of credibility*, much dilated on by Catholick Writers. [‘As: ‘*From the multitude of those, who have affirmed their receiving of these* ‘*divine Revelations from those, who were known by Miracles to be sent* ‘*from God; the multitude of them I say, together with their wisdom;* ‘*their sanctity; their unanimous consent throughout so many ages; their* ‘*affirming such truth much contrary to all their secular interests, to the* ‘*appetites of the flesh, and ambitions of this world; their delivering* ‘*them both by word and writing to their children and posterity, to be de-* ‘*livered again to theirs, as matters of the highest moment, and wherein* ‘*it eternally concerneth them not to be deceived; as also their strict* ‘*charge to deliver nothing in these matters of faith to their children,* ‘*which they have not received from their Forefathers; their suffering* ‘*many times cruel deaths for the verity of their testimony; the mira-* ‘*cles in several ages done also by them, which miracles when done for the* ‘*testifying of their Faith, such in those ages, as have seen, have had the* ‘*like evidence of this Faith, as those, who saw the miracles of the Apo-* ‘*stles; and those who have not seen, but believe the credible Relators of* ‘*them, have the like evidence of their Faith, as those also had in the* ‘*Apostles times, who believed (as doubtless many did), not seeing, but on-* ‘*ly hearing of, their miracles*]. If I say I proceed this, to prove the Church-Tradition infallible from these motives of credibility, Here again it is asked concerning these *motives*; whether they also be pretended *infallible*; and whether they carry a certainty in them equall to that infallible assent of *divine* faith, that is

given to Divine Revelations; and particularly, to this of the infallibility of the Church (which assent of *divine* faith is pretended to be more firm, than any humane *knowledge* can be, because it doth ultimately rest upon *divine authority*; and yet which *divine* faith, at last, to avoid a Circle, is by Catholicks for its certainty, made to rest upon these prudential *motives*); It is asked therefore, in the last place, whether these *motives* be pretended not-possibly-fallible, or no. If not, how can an infallible, or divine faith be grounded on motives only highly probable, or only morally certain; or the thing that is proved, or Conclusion, be rendred certain, and not-possibly-fallible to me, from a possibly-fallible proof, or *medium*? since the thing proving, or the ground of my assent, must be more credible, evident, and certain to me, than the thing proved. But, if these motives also be affirmed infallible; 1st. How can that be? since all men however taken, divided, or conjoyned, single or a multitude, vulgar or wise and learned, are (possibly) liable both to deceive, and to be deceived; and 2ly. Thus at least *divine* faith will at last be built upon, and resolved into, not *divine*, but *humane*, authority; contrary to the Doctrine of Catholicks.

§. 122. And if it should be said here; that the resolution of *divine* faith into these prudential motives (whether fallible or infallible) is only as into extrinsecal *prerequisites*, or *introductives* to it; not, as into the *formal* cause, or *ground* of it: for (so) I ground always the divine, and infallible assent I give to any Article of my faith upon Divine Revelation, and the prime verity, because God, who I believe saith it, cannot lye. It will be asked still, since *some* Divine Revelation is always the *final* motive of a Divine Faith, from what other Divine Revelation I do believe such a point to be a Divine Revelation; in which proceeding, if it go not in *infinitum*, I must come at last to some Divine Revelation, concerning which I can produce no other revelation divine (and so no ground at all), why, or from which, I can believe it with a Divine Faith to be such; unless I will betake my self to a Circle. So for example in proving *the Churches infallibility* from Divine Revelation contained in the *Scriptures*; and again the Scriptures *God's Word*, from Divine Revelation *unwritten* delivered by the Apostles, I can produce no further Divine Revelation, that testifies such Revelation, or Tradition to be delivered by the Apostles, if I return not back to the Church's infallibility, which returning thither makes a Circle. And the same thing will happen the other way also; in proving *Scripture* from *Apostolical Tradition*; and this *Apostolical Tradition* again from *Church-infallibility*.

To

§. 123.

To which intricate Question to answer as distinctly as I can.

1st. It is agreed by all; *That the faith, by which we are saved, must be in it self most true, and infallible; or that there must be a* certitudo objecti, *and those be true Revelations, which our faith apprehends to be so.*

§. 124. n. 1.

2ly. Agreed also; *That such divine, and saving faith doth alwayes ground it self on God's Word, or Divine Revelation, of those things which are believed, and upon the authority, veracity, and goodness of God revealing such things*; And that Christians, however coming to the knowledge of these Divine Revelations, from their *Parents, Pastors*, or *the Church* in her Councils, yet resolve this divine faith no otherwise, as to the ultimate ground, and reason of their believing, than the *Apostles* themselves did (who received these Revevelations immediately from Christ and God himself) namely into the veracity of God, delivering such particular Articles of their Faith.

§. 124. n. 2.

3ly. Again agreed; *That this Divine Faith is wrought no otherwise in the soul, than by the operation of God's Spirit* †; many times begetting so firm an adherence to the things believed (not only, that what is Divine Revelation cannot deceive, but that such particular points are Divine Revelations) as exceeds that adherence we have to any humane Science whatsoever (wherein there is, often, a possibility of deceit, though not as to the thing, yet as to us; *i.e.* that we may think we know what, and when, we do not).

† *See S. Thom.* 22. *q.* 6. *De causâ fidei.*

For this see the Arch-Bp. † — '*Faith* [he means the habit, or act of a saving faith] *is the gift of God alone, and an infused* 'habit, *in respect whereof the soul is meerly recipient: And therefore* 'the *sole infuser, the Holy Ghost, must not be excluded from that work*, 'which none can do but he — *Which virtue of faith, of whatever Article*, 'though it receive a kind of *preparation, or occasion of beginning from* 'the *testimony of the Church, as it proposeth, and inducеth to the faith*; 'yet it *ends in God's revealing within, and teaching within that, which* 'the Church *preached without* — And p. 75. — *Man (do what he can) is* 'still *apt to search, and seek for a reason, why he will believe*; *though, af*'ter *he once believes, his faith grows stronger than either his reason, or* 'his *knowledge*; *and great reason for this, because it goes higher, and so,* 'upon *a safer Principle, than either of the other* [reason, or knowledge] 'can *in this life*; quoting in the margin S. *Thom.* † — *Quia scientiæ cer*'*titudinem habent ex naturali lumine rationis humanæ, quæ potest* 'errare; *Theologia autem (quæ docet & objectum, & notitiam fi*'*dei,*

† p. 72.

† p. 1. q. 1. a. 5.

'dei, ſicut & fidem ipſam) certitudinem habet ex lumine divinæ
In 3 ſent. 23 d. q. 2. A. 1. 'ſcientiæ, quæ decipi non poteſt — And Biel † — Hoc autem ita intel-
'ligendum eſt, ut ſcientia certior ſit certitudine evidentiæ; Fides
'verò certior firmitate adhæſionis. Majus lumen in ſcientiâ, majus
'robur in fide. Et hoc, quia in fide, & ad fidem Actus imperatus vo-
'luntatis concurrit. Credere enim eſt actus intellectus, vero aſſen-
'tientis productus ex voluntatis imperio.. — Again p. 86. — Faith
'(ſaith he) is an evidence, as well as knowledge, and the belief is firmer
'than any knowledge can be, becauſe it reſts upon divine authority, which
'cannot deceive; whereas knowledge (or at leaſt he that thinks he knows)
'is not ever certain in deductions from Principles. And if there be
'any, that ſhould deny ſuch a Divine or infuſed faith wrought in
'Chriſtians by God's Spirit, beſides and beyond the evidence which
'a moral certainty rationally affords, let them declare, how a Chri-
'ſtians faith is neceſſarily a Grace of the Holy Spirit; where there is
'no effect in it, that is aſcribed to the Spirit; but all that they attri-
'bute to it, is neceſſarily conſequent to another humane, and ratio-
'nal evidence; and no other ground of their faith of the Divine
'truths alledged by them, than of the being of a Julius Cæſar, viz. a
'credible and morally-certain Tradition.]

§. 125. 4ly. Therefore, concerning any certainty or aſſurance that Chriſtians *are neceſſarily* to have of *this* their faith, that, it is true, and infallible (which certitude all true believers have not alike †): Here alſo I think all are agreed; *That ſuch a certainty one* may *have from the inward light and operation of God's Holy Spirit, though he ſhould have neither any internal ſcientifical demonſtration thereof* (which if he hath, it is not faith); *nor extrinſecal infallible motive, teſtimony, or proponent thereof whatever; but, though only he hath that, which is in it ſelf truly a Divine Revelation, for the object thereof.*

† Mat. 14. 31 --S. Thom. 22. q. 5 a. 4.

§. 126. 5ly. Since the Church may be conſidered, either * as a Society already manifeſted by divine Teſtimony, and Revelation (whether this written, the Scriptures; or unwritten, Apoſtolical Tradition) to be by the holy Ghoſt for ever aſſiſted, and guided in all neceſſary truths; Or, before any ſuch divine Teſtimony known, * as a multitude of men famous in wiſdom, innocency of life, ſufferings, &c. things prudentially moving us to credit all their Traditions, Both Churches here agree: *That humane Teſtimony, or Church-Tradition,* [taken in the later ſence] *in its making known to us, what are theſe Divine Revelations, or this Word of God, is only* introductive *to this* divine *faith, which relies on, and adheres to, the* Revelations *themſelves, as its* formal object.

'Scrip-

[‘ *Scripture is the ground of our faith: Tradition, the Key that* ‘ *lets us in* (ſaith Arch-Bp. *Lawd* †) Divine Revelation (writ- ‘ten or unwritten) is the formal Object, or ultimate divine motive ‘ into which we reſolve our faith; and the Churches Tradition, te- ‘ſtifying or manifeſting to us theſe matters revealed, is a condition ‘ and prerequiſite or introductive, for the application of our faith ‘ unto thoſe Divine Revelations, on which we exerciſe it, ſay the ‘ Catholicks.] † p. 86.

6ly. Catholicks further affirm; *That, as the Church is conſidered in the former of the two acceptions formentioned*; *the* infallible authority *and* teſtimony *thereof is not only an introductive into, but one of the Articles of, this* divine *faith*; *as being grounded on Divine Revelation*; *and that ſo many, as believe the Church's infallibility in this ſence, may ſafely reſolve their* divine *Faith of other Articles of their belief into its delivering them, as ſuch.* But then they hold; *That the Church's infallibility thus believed, is not neceſſarily the ultimate Principle, into which this divine Faith of other Articles is reſolved, but that Word of God, (written or unwritten), by which this Church-infallibility is manifeſted to them.* And again; *That whatever this infallible authority of the Church be, it is not neceſſary, that every one for attaining a divine ~~authority~~, and ſaving faith, be infallibly certain of this infallible Church-authority.* Or, it is not neceſſary: *That, for attaining a divine faith of the Articles of the Chriſtian belief, he have ſome extrinſecal motive, or proponent, (whether it be of the Church, or any other ſave the prime verity) of which he is infallibly certain, that it is infallible.* Which thing is copiouſly proved by many learned Catholicks; a few of whoſe teſtimonies I have here inſerted; which the Reader may paſs over, if in this matter ſatisfied. §. 127.

[‘ Concerning this thus Cardinal *Lugo* a *Spaniſh* Jeſuit, ‘ ſpeaking of *divine* faith † —*Probatur facilè*; *quia hoc ipſum* [Eccle- ‘ſiam habere authoritatem infallibilem ex aſſiſtentia Spiritus ſancti] ‘ *creditur fide divinâ, quæ docet in Eccleſiâ eſſe hujuſmodi authoritatem, ergo ante ipſius fidei aſſenſum, non poteſt requiri cognitio hujus infallibilis authoritatis. Et experientia docet non omnes pueros, vel adultos, qui de novo ad fidem accedunt, concipere* [muchleſs, infallibiliter ſcire] ‘ *in Eccleſiâ hanc infallibilem authoritatem, & aſſiſtentiam Spiritus ſancti, antequam ullum alium articulum credant. Credunt enim Articulos in ordine, quo proponuntur. Hunc autem Articulum authoritatis Eccleſiaſticæ contingit credi, poſtquam alios plures crediderunt. Solum ergo poteſt ad ſummum prærequiri, cognoſcere res fidei proponi ab Eccleſia; concipiendo in Eccleſiâ ſecundum ſe authoritatem maximam humanam, quæ reperitur in univerſâ fidelium congregatione* —n. 252. §. 128. † *Tom. de virtute fidei. diſp.* 1. §. 12. p. 247.

—'*In lege naturæ plures credebant ex solâ doctrinâ parentum, sine aliâ* 'Ecclesiæ propositione. *Deinde in lege scriptô plures crediderunt Moysi, &* 'aliis Prophetis, *antequam eorum Prophetiæ ab Ecclesiâ reciperentur* [I add; or before they saw their miracles, or the fulfilling of their Prophecies].

§. 129. † *In. 3. sent. 23. d. 13. §.*

Thus *Estius* † speaking also of this divine, and salvifical faith — *Fidei impertinens est, quo medio Deus utatur ad conferendum homini donum fidei* [i. e. divinæ] *quamvis enim nunc ordinarium medium sit Ecclesiæ testificatio, & doctrina, constat tamen aliis viis, seu mediis fidem collatam fuisse aliquando, & adhuc conferri, &c. Nam antiqui multi, ut* Abraham, Melchizedech, Job, *ex speciali revelatione; Apostoli ex Christi miraculis, & sermone* [yet these having no other formal, or ultimate motive of their faith, than we have] *rursus ex Apostolorum prædicatione, & miraculis* [I add, and some without, and before, seeing their miracles; and others by a credible relation only, not sight, of their miracles; yet all these mens faith of the same nature and efficiency] *alii fidem conceperunt; alii denique aliis modis crediderant; cùm nondùm de infallibilitate doctrinæ Ecclesiasticæ, quicquam eis esset annunciatum. Sic ergo fieri potest, ut aliquis non adhærens doctrinæ Ecclesiasticæ, tanquam regulæ infallibili, quædam ad fidem pertinentia pro Dei verbo recipiat, quia vel nunc, vel olim, miraculis confirmata sunt; vel etiam, quia veterem Ecclesiam sic docuisse manifestè videt, vel aliâ quacunque ratione inductus, licet alia quædam credere recuset.*

§. 130. † *Theol. moral. 2. l. tract. 1. 5. c.*

Thus *Paul Layman* a Jesuit † — *Fieri sæpè solet, ut alii Articuli fidei nostræ, puta quæ sunt de Deo uno, & trino, explicitè credantur ante hunc, quæ est de infallibili Ecclesiæ authoritate. Quinimò hæc Ecclesiæ infallibilitas Spiritus sancti promissione nititur, ergo prius oportet credere Spiritum sanctum, adeoque Trinitatem in divinis esse. Præterea constat primos Christianos fide divinâ credidisse: non ob authoritatem Ecclesiæ, quæ vel fundata non erat (v. g. cum Sanctus Petrus credidit Christum esse Filium Dei vivi, Mat. 16.) vel nondum fidei dogmata definierat.* Again: *His adde, non tantùm variis motivis homines ad fidem amplectendam moveri; sed etiam alios aliis facilius, partim propter majorem internam Spiritus sancti illustrationem, & impulsionem (sicuti notavit Valentia q. 1. part. 4. arg. 8.) partim pro animi sui simplicitate, quia de opposito errore persuasionem nullam conceperunt; quâ ratione pueri apud Catholicos, cum ad usum rationis pervenerunt, acceptant fidei mysteria tanquam divinitus revelata, quia natu majores, & prudentes, quos ipsi norunt, ita credere animadvertunt.* Again — *Formale assentiendi principium, seu motivum non est Ecclesiæ authoritas. Si enim ex te quæram, cur credas Deum esse incarnatum? Respondeasque; Quia Ecclesia Catholica, quæ errare non potest, ob sancti spiritus assistentiam, ita testatur; iterum ex se quæram, unde id scias? vel, cur credas*

das Ecclesiam errare non posse ; vel sanctum Spiritum ei assistere ? Quare recte dixit Canus †. *Si generaliter quæratur, unde fideli constet, ea quæ fide tenet, esse à Deo revelata, non poterit infallibilem Ecclesiæ authoritatem adducere ; quia unum ex revelatis est, quòd Ecclesia errare non possit. Interim non negamus* (saith he) *quin resolutio fidei in authoritatem Ecclesiæ, quatenus spiritu sancto regitur, fieri possit, & communiter soleat, à fidelibus ipsis, qui infallibilem spiritus sancti assistentiam ac directionem Ecclesiæ promissam certâ fidei tenent ; his enim ejus testimonium, ac definitio, certa regula est ad alios articulos amplectendos.* Thus he of the Church, as it is a Society manifested by Divine Revelation to be infallibly assisted in all necessaries by the holy Ghost. But then, as it appears to us, before such revelation, only as an *illustris congregatio tot hominum excellentium*, &c. he speaks of it on this manner — *Fidei divinæ assensus in* [hanc] *authoritatem Ecclesiæ non resolvitur, tanquam in principium, sed tanquam in extrinsecum adjumentum, & conditionem, sine qua non. Etenim authoritas illa Ecclesia, non quatenus consideratur ut organum Spiritus sancti, sed ut illustris congregatio hominum prudentum, &c. est quidem formale principium credendi fide humanâ ; sed non fide divina. Quia fides divina est, quâ Deo dicenti credimus ob authoritatem & veritatem ejus ; consequenter qui credit propter authoritatem hominum, vel simile motivum humanum, is fide solum humanâ credit. Accedit, quòd (sicuti ipsimet Scotus, & Gabriel argumentantur) assensus cognoscitivus non possit excedere certitudinem principii quo nititur ; assensus autem fidei divinæ certitudinem infallibilem habet ; quo fieri non potest, ut assensus fidei divinæ, tanquam principio nitatur authoritati hominum, vel simili motivo humano, quippe quod secundum se absolute fallibile est.*

† *Loc. Theol. l. 2. c. 8.*

Thus *Fa. Knott* † (in his Reply to Mr. *Chillingworth*) affirming Christians may have a true infallible divine faith, of which faith they have only a fallible proponent, nor are infallibly certain thereof, *i. e.* as to the proponent — *From the unlearned* (saith he) *God exacts no more, but that they proceed prudently according to the measure of their several capacities ; and use such diligence, as men ought in a matter of highest moment. All Christians of the primitive Church were not present when the Apostles spoke, or wrote ; yea it is not certain, that every one of those thousands, whom S.* Peter *converted, did hear every sentence he spake, but might believe some by relation of others, who stood near* — And (c. 1. p. 64.) the same author saith ; *That a Preacher, or Pastor, whose testimonies are humane, and fallible, when they declare to their hearers, or subjects, that some truth is witnessed by God's Word, are an occasion, that those people may produce a true infallible act of faith, depending immediately upon Divine Revelation applyed by the said means* — And — *If you object* (saith he) *that perhaps that humane au-*

§. 131. † p. 358.

thority is false, and proposeth to my understanding divine Revelation, when God doth not reveal, therefore, I cannot, upon humane testimony representing, or applying Divine Revelation, exercise an infallible act of faith, I answer; it is one thing, whether by a reflex act I am absolutely certain, that I exercise an infallible act of faith, and another, whether indeed, and in actu exercito *I produce such an act. Of the former I have said nothing, neither makes it to our present purpose. Of the latter I affirm, that, when* indeed *humane testimony is true* [though not certainly known to me to be so] *and so applies a Divine Revelation which really exists: in such a case I may believe, by a true infallible assent of Christian faith:* [*viz.* from the divine supernatural concourse, which he affirms † necessary to every act of divine faith.]

† p. 358.

§. 132. Therefore, here it is much to be noted; that divine faith *quatenus* divine (which is therefore so called, because we believe God that saith it, for his own authority and veracity, whose certainty, or infallibility, or unliableness to deceive, infinitely exceeds all created certainties moral, or natural; all which are liable to a *possibility* of deception; even that of our *senses*) cannot be resolved into any thing further, than 1st. (As to any external motive, ground, reason, or principle thereof that is of equal certainty) into that particular *Divine Revelation*, which is *first* made known to me, or from which, in building of my faith, I proceed to the rest; which revelation is not to all alwayes the same; but to some Christians one, to some another, in which ultimate Revelation this divine faith terminates. 2^ly. (As to the inward efficient thereof) into the power or grace of the holy Spirit, both illuminating the understanding; that the prime verity cannot lye, in whatever things it revealeth; and that the particular Articles of our faith are its Revelations; and perswading, and operating, in the will such a firm adherence of our faith thereto, as many times far exceeds that of any humane Science, or demonstrations.

§. 133. † *Loc. Theol.* 2. *l.* c. 8.

[Of which matter thus *Canus* † —'*Si generaliter quæratur;* '*unde fideli constet ea, quæ fide tenet, esse à Deo revelata, non poterit Ec-* '*clesiæ authoritatem inducere, quia unum de revelatis est, Ecclesiam er-* '*rare non posse* [*Non poterit: i.e.* as this Proposition, *Ecclesia non potest* '*errare* is the object of a divine faith, from the Scriptures declaring 'it assisted with the holy Ghost; and not the object of an acquisite 'faith, from the prudential motives, as the same Church is *illustris* '*congregatio hominum prudentum*, &c.] —Again *Ib.*—— *Ultima fi-* '*dei nostræ resolutio fit in causam interiorem efficientem, hoc est, in Deum* '*moventem ad credendum— Itaque ex parte objecti ratio formalis movens* '*est divina veritas revelans; sed illa tamen non sufficit ad movendum,* '*nisi adsit causa interior, hoc est, Deus etiam movens per gratuitum specialemque*

'alemque concursum — And — quantumcunque competenter, ea quæ 'sunt fidei proponantur, necessaria est insuper causa interior, hoc est, di- 'vinum quoddam lumen incitans ad credendum — Where he urgeth, 1 Cor. 12. c. — 'Nemo potest dicere, Dominus Jesus, nisi in spiritu sancto; And, Gal. 1. c. The adherence of this faith not to be shaken by the contrary testimony of men, and Angels; and that our faith must be the very same with that of the Apostles (who received the matter believed immediately from God) in its essence, and, as to the formal object, and internal efficient thereof; however the external motives thereof do vary: by which infused, and divine faith also he saith, we believe *Deum esse trinum* [I add, or *Ecclesiam non posse errare*] much more firmly, and certainly, than we can believe them by any acquisite faith from the prudential motives, which we have thereof. And of the same matter thus *Layman*, in the place before quoted — 'Major, imò maxima, & certissima animi adhæsio, 'quam fides divina continet, non ex viribus naturæ aut humanis persua- 'sionibus provenit; sed ab auxilio Spiritus sancti, succurrentis intellectui '& liberæ voluntati nostræ. And, speaking of the understanding and the will's accepting of the first Divine Revelation, beyond which it can proceed no further, discoursively, to any former Revelation — 'Acceptat (saith he †) intellectus primæ veritatis testimonium † 2. l. tract. 1. 'i°. Per-scientiam infusam; quâ intellectus elevatus evidenter perspi- c. 4. 'ciat revelationem à primâ veritate fieri, &c. 2°. Per actum fides im- 'mediatum, ad quem eliciendum (i. e. acceptandum, seu credendum, re- 'velationem à primâ veritate esse), extrinsecè prærequiruntur humana 'motiva, quibus acquisita fides immititur e intrinsecè vero & in gene- 're causæ efficientis, requiritur Spiritus sancti gratia supplens, quod 'humanæ infirmitati ad supernaturalem infallibilem fidei assensum elici- 'endum deest. [I add, *per quam gratiam* fides divina *producitur*] Here *scientia infusa*, and, *Spiritus sancti gratia* are made the first Operators of divine faith or assent to the first Divine Revelation. This for the internal efficient of divine faith; as for the external first principle thereof —— 'Quod vero (saith he †) ad formalem fidei resolutio † Ib 'nem attinet, expeditus, ac verus dicendi modus est iste apud Caietan 2. 2. 'q. 1. a. 1. Quòd fides divina, ex parte objecti, ac motivi formalis, re- 'solvatur in authoritatem Dei revelantis: Credo, Deum esse incarna- 'tum, Ecclesiæ definientis authoritatem infallibilem esse; quia prima, '& summa, veritas revelavit. Deum autem veracem talia nobis reve- 'lasse ulterius resolvi, vel per fidem [i.e. divinam] probari non potest, nec 'debet: Quandoquidem principia resolutionis non probantur, sed suppo- 'nuntur. [only, as he said before; *maxima & certissima animi ad- 'hæsio* to this ultimate Divine Revelation, *provenit ab auxilio Spiritus 'sancti, succurrentis intellectui*, &c.] But now, *fides humana*, or *acquisita*

'sita, can go on, and give a further *ground* or *motive*, both why it believes, *Deum veracem talia revelasse*; and, *se fidem hanc* [*Deum revelasse*] *habere ex auxilio Spiritus sancti*: and this a motive too, morally-infallible, viz. the *Consent of the Church*, or *universal Tradition*. Of which he goes on thus — *Verùm, in ordine ad nos, revelatio divina credibilis & acceptabilis fit per extrinseca motiva; inter quæ unum ex præcipuis meritò censetur, authoritas & consentus Ecclesiæ* [as understood above §. 126.] *tot sæculis, tanto numero hominum clarissimorum florentis*. But then, this evident, or morally-infallible motive, is not held alwayes necessary neither for an humane induction to divine faith. For he proceeds — *Quamvis id non unicum, nec simpliciter necessarium motivum est; quandoquidem non omnes eodem modo, sed alii aliter ad fidem Christi amplectendam moventur*, &c. And thus Fa. Knot † quoted before — *A man may exercise* (saith he) *an infallible act of faith, though his immediate instructor, or proposer be not infallible, because he believes upon a ground, which both is believed by him to be infallible, and is such indeed, to wit*, the Word of God: *Who therefore will not deny his supernatural concourse necessary to every act of divine faith*. [Here he grounds the infallibility of this act of divine faith, on the supernatural concourse, or operation of God's Spirit]. *Otherwise* (saith he) *in the ordinary course, there would be no means left for the faith, and salvation of unlearned persons*.]

† p. 358.

§. 134. And indeed, from what is said formerly, That a divine faith may be had by those, who have had no extrinsecal, even morally infallible, motive thereof, it follows, that divine faith doth not resolve into such motives, either as the formal cause, or alwayes as the applicative introductive, or condition of this divine faith. And, of whatever infallibility the *immediate* proponent of the matter of my faith, or of Divine Revelation, be, yet divine faith ascends higher than it, and fastneth it self still to the infallibility of him, whose *primarily* is the Revelation.

So the Church, which I give credit to, declaring to me, that the things contained in the *Gospel* of *S. Matthew* were divinely revealed, I resolve my faith of the truth of those *contents*, not into the Church's saying they are true, though I believe all that true the Church sayeth; but into Divine Revelation, because God by his Evangelist delivereth them for truth. Again, when I believe, that all contained in S. *Matthew's Gospel* is true, because the Church tells me it is so; and then believe, that the Church telleth me true, because God hath revealed in some one part of his Word, that the Church in this shall not err; here my faith is ultimately resolved again, not into the Church's authority, but the Divine Revelation concerning the Church. But if 3ly. I believe S. *Matthew's*

Gospel

Gospel true, because the *Church* tells me so; and again believe the Church's veracity in what it saith, only from the forementioned *prudential motives* † inducing me to believe so; here I resolve my faith into these *credible motives*; and this is no *infused*, or *divine*, but an *humane*, and *acquisite* faith; and the assent to the thing believed can rationally be no firmer, or stronger, then it is to these credible proofs thereof. Thus then, when the authority of the Relator is the same; yet the things related are diversly believed by me, according to the varying of those Grounds, or that authority which the Relator urgeth to make them credible. When a *very credible* person relates to me several things, which he hath heard of two other persons, of whom I have a very different esteem; the one accounted by me very skilful, and learned in his Art; the other not so; here I give an assent, or belief, to the words of these two persons, though both related to me with the same fidelity, very *different*; much *stronger* to the related words of him, whom I esteem as it were infallible in his skill, much *weaker* to the others; and I give a third assent different from both these to the *veracity* of the *Relator*, or to the credibility of the person relating these things to me concerning them.

† §. 121.

This being said of a *divine* faith (in the several assertions precedent), That it is produced in us by the operation of the Holy Ghost, and grounded still on divine Revelation: But that it is not necessary † that such faith alwayes should have an external rationally-infallible ground, or motive thereto (whether Church-authority, or any other) on his part, that so believes.

§. 135.

† §. 127, &c.

Yet, 7ly. It is also affirmed; *That there are* morally-certain, *or* infallible grounds, *or motives producible, both for the Christian Religion, and faith, in General; and for all the Articles thereof, as they are believed in the Catholick Church: which grounds, or any equal to them, no* other Religion *besides* Christianity; *nor, in Christianity, no* other Sect, *or seducing* private Spirit, *out of the Catholick Church, can possibly plead, or pretend to.* So that, though many *seducing* spirits, as it were in emulation of the *Holy* One, do use to pretend, and set up themselves for assurers of a divine Faith; and many times do effect so firm an adherence to most false Revelations, as that from this persuasion many have exposed themselves even to suffer death, in defence of their errors; yet this ever remains a constant way of distinguishing to the world, and to all mens reason, a true divine faith wrought by God's holy Spirit, from these counterfeit ones wrought by the evil Spirit, that Catholicks for this divine faith, which the Holy Ghost only works in them, as to such a supernatural

powerful

powerful and vivifical efficacy thereof, yet alwayes have, besides this, many extrinsecal motives, and assurances to render it (I say not Divine, which such motives cannot do) but in reason credible and acceptable to themselves, and others, which no false Religion, no false faith can produce, or lay claim to; I mean still the former *Motives*; which, whenas the internal plerophory of this faith wrought by the Spirit is not publickly conspicuous or manifestive abroad, are a standing rational evidence of the verity of Christianity against all other Sects of Religion; and against all Hereticks, *&c.* Only of these motives it is affirmed; . That, without the operation of God's Spirit, they are never able to found a divine faith. And . That by the holy Spirit many times a divine faith is produced without the concurrence of them. Concerning this see the former quotations §. 133.

§. 136. And here, first, a rational certainty, or morally infallible ground of a Christians faith for this point, that the Scriptures (I mean, as to the main body of them, those few books set aside, which the Protestants call Apocryphal) are the Word of God; and consequently, whatever is contained therein, and all the Articles of the Christian faith that are grounded thereon infallible, is affirmed by Protestants as well, as Catholicks.

And, 1st. This certainty *Protestants* do affirm to arise from that *plenary Church-Tradition*, which is found to have delivered these to be God's Word, and Divine Revelation throughout all ages from the Apostles times; which Apostles confirmed them with miracles. Of which thus the Arch-Bp † —— *If you speak* (saith he to *A. C.*) *of assurance only in general* [and not of that by divine faith]; *I must then make bold to tell you (and it is the greatest advantage, which the Church of Christ hath against Infidels) a man may be assured, nay* infallibly *assured by Ecclesiastical, and humane proof. Men that never saw* Rome *may be sure, and infallibly believe that such a City there is, by Historical, and acquired faith. And if consent of* humane *story can assure me this; why should not consent of* Church-*story assure me the other, That Christ and his Apostles delivered this Body of Scripture as the Oracles of God?* And again--*Certain it is* (saith he) *that by humane authority consent and proof, a man may be assured infallibly, that the Scripture is the Word of God by an acquired habit of faith, cui non subest falsum* [i. e. speaking of an usual, and constant, moral certainty, and non-falsity of things]; *but he cannot be assured infallibly by Divine faith, cui subesse non potest falsum* [i.e. speaking of an absolute possibility of falsity or mistake of things, especially by the divine power interposing; in which sence nothing is free from deception, save Divine Revelation], *but by a divine testimony.*

† p. 124.

And

§. 137.

And Mr. *Stillingfleet* saith of the same tradition †—*That the moral certainty that is therein* ‖ *yields us a sufficient assurance, that the matter delivered to us to be believed, is infallibly true; and, considering the nature of moral things, is a certainty as great, and begetting as firm an assent, as any certainty Mathematical, or Physical; the greatest Physical certainty* (saith he) *being as liable to question, as moral; there being as great a possibility of deception in that, as a suspicion of doubt in this; and oftentimes greater.* [‘ Though his discourse ‘ there; † That, *where God obligeth us to believe, we have the greatest ‘ assurance that the matter to be believed is infallibly true, because God ‘ cannot oblige men to believe a lye*; from whence he would prove, ‘ *that we have a sufficient assurance, that Christian Religion is infallibly ‘ true, only from a moral certainty thereof*, If he means infallibly true ‘ to us, and applies *infallibly* not to the *object*, but *act* of faith, seems ‘ faulty; Because God may oblige us to believe either a thing to be ‘ infallibly true, *i. e.* as to us, so as that there can be no possibility of ‘ our error in it, or only most credibly so, according to the proof or ‘ ground we have of such belief. Therefore, though it is true, ‘ which he saith: *That God never obligeth us to believe* [i.e. to be ab- ‘ solutely true] *what is really a lye, or false*: and true also; *that, if ‘ we know, that God obligeth us to believe a thing to be infallibly true, we ‘ have the greatest assurance, that such thing is infallibly true*: Yet so, ‘ 1. Is this true, that God obligeth us to believe, nor *for infal- ‘ libly*, but only *for most credibly true*, what is from those principles, ‘ which right reason can attain of it, only most credibly so; And ‘ 2. So is this also true; that God hath not obliged us to believe ‘ Christianity as infallibly true from the moral certainty we ‘ have thereof; supposing that this moral certainty is not ab- ‘ solutely infallible, I mean as to a possibility of the contrary. Upon ‘ this supposition therefore, that our *moral certainty*, or assurance, on ‘ which we ground the verity of Christian Religion involves a *possibi- ‘ lity of falshood*, God doth not oblige us to believe Christian Reli- ‘ gion, with an *acquisite* or *rational* faith from this evidence, as freed ‘ from all *possibility of falshood*, or as absolutely infallible; but to be- ‘ lieve, in the same degree, the one to be credible, as we do the ‘ other; in the same degree Christian Religion true as we do the ‘ ground thereof, and no further. And here Mr. *Stillingfleet* seems ‘ to incur the fault he imputes to others † of making the conclusion ‘ *surer*, than the premises, if he would make Christian Religion by ‘ this way any whit more infallible than moral certainty is. [So also ‘ in the next page ‡ if he pretends to prove, from that text of Scrip- ‘ ture, *Joh.* 16. 13. any infallible assurance; (and not only a moral ‘ certainty to us, of the Apostle's infallibility in the conveyance of

† p. 205, 211
‖ p. 207.
† p. 207.
† *Ibid.*
‡ p. 208.

'Scripture, himself must incur the Circle he objects to Catholicks.' 'For, since we have this Text of Scripture only from their convey-'ance, I cannot be infallibly assured of the truth of it, till first so 'assured of their infallibility in conveying it]. 3ly. It is true 'also; That, when reason is not rightly used by us, and when that 'seems to us, from false reasoning, most credible, which in right rea-'son is not, yet, that here also God obligeth us to believe this, the 'most credible, but then he obligeth us to believe this most credi-'ble hypothetically only, and upon supposition, that our reasons and 'reasonings are good; and therefore we are obliged by him herein 'only to believe a truth; namely, this thing to be most credible hy-'pothetically, *&c.* though the thing which we believe thus hypothe-'tically most credible, is absolutely not true. (As also God ob-'ligeth us to follow an erroneous conscience. Neither do we sin in 'this *following* it; to which God obligeth us, and which we do only 'upon supposition, that it is not erroneous: for if we knew it erro-'neous, we might not follow it; but we sin in not better informing 'it, where God also obligeth us to the contrary). But to let these 'things pass: I grant (what Protestants affirm) That the moral evi-'dence we have from Tradition is sufficient to produce such an assu-'rance of Christian Religion, as God requires us to have of it by an 'acquisite and rational faith: and that both this evidence of the truth 'of Christian Religion, and our faith built on it, are morally infalli-'ble.] This of the sufficient certainty of Church-Tradition concerning Scripture, and so, concerning all the Articles of Christian Faith, that are built thereon, affirmed by Protestants. Upon which ground also, they freely grant †: That, if any other point, wherein they dissent from Catholicks, can be proved by as universal a Tradition, as that of the Scriptures, they will subscribe to it.

† *See Chillingw.* p. 114. —*Stillingf.* p. 216.

§. 138.

2. Again: the same sufficient certainty, Catholicks also affirm, to be in *Church Tradition* for what it delivers; but withall they urge many motives of credibility concurring in it †, which are not so much insisted on by Protestants; some of which motives may add to a Tradition of a less latitude a moral certainty as great or greater from the dignity of the persons, as a more universal Tradition may have, from the multitude of Testators; amongst which *motives* also are the *miracles* done in several ages by such persons. And by these *motives* also, Catholicks affirm, * that the true Religion may be rationally evident, and discerned from all false ones, whether they be *within*, or *without*, the pale of Christianity: none of which Sects can produce like evidence for their faith: and, * that by these our faith is demonstrated a rational service, *Rom.* 12. 1. 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. These *motives* likewise are acknowledged by them to

† *See before* §. 121.

be

be the ultimate resolution of *an humane faith*, which is begotten by them: and that, in respect of such a faith, they are the formal principle of believing: nor that such *faith* doth exceed the *certitude* of this *principle*; and that the assent we yeild to the Articles, which we believe only on this account, is no stronger, or certainer, than these motives be, on which it is grounded. All which things as Protestants earnestly contend for †, so there seems no reason, why they should be denied them. [Of this matter thus the fore-quoted Author *Layman*, out of *Scotus* and others ‖ —— ' *Qui credit* ' *propter authoritatem hominum vel simile motivum humanum, is fide so-* ' *lummodò humanâ credit* —— And —— *Authoritas illa Ecclesiæ, non* ' *quatenus consideratur, ut organum Spiritus sancti* [which we learn ' from Divine Revelation, the Scripture's being the Word of God ' first supposed] *sed ut illustris congregatio hominum prudentum, &c. est* ' *quidem formale principium credendi fide humanâ* —— And —— *Accedit,* ' *quòd assensus cognoscitivus non potest excedere certitudinem principii,* ' *quo nititur.*]

† *See Stillingf.* p. 137. 140 *Archbishop Laud.* p. 61. ‖ *Theol. moral.* p. 183.

§. 139. This is said concerning a sufficiently certain evidence in *Church-Tradition*, &c. (agreed on both by Catholicks, and Protestants) That the Scriptures (at least the books of it called by Protestants Canonical) are the Word of God. But then 2^ly. The Protestant's declining the admission of Church-Traditions that are less universal, than that of Scripture is thought unreasonable; 1. Because, of two Traditions, whereof one appears more universal than the other, yet the lesser also may have a sufficient certainty in it, whereon to build a rational belief; and hence Protestants may have reason enough to admit several other Traditions, though not all equally universal; or any so universal, as that of the Scriptures. For the wars of *Cæsar* and *Pompey*, descend by a more universal Tradition, namely, that both of Christians, and *Mahometans*, than this; that the Bible is God's Word; and yet this later carries with it a sufficient evidence: and Protestants themselves † do both allow, and practise several *Traditions* as *Apostolical*, which yet have not the same fulness of Tradition, as the Scriptures; nor indeed more, than several of those points have, whereof yet they deny a sufficient Tradition. 2. Again, the Tradition of a smaller number of persons, if eminent in sanctity, and miracles, and other forenamed † motives of credit, may be as, or more credible, than that of a greater number, not so qualified. Of several other Traditions, then, what, or how many, in particular carry a sufficient fulness, and evidence in them (though all do not the same) to beget a rational belief, this, after the *Church's authority* once established by *Scripture*, and *Tradition*, private men may safely learn from the same Church.

† *See Disc.* 2. §. 40. n. 2.

† §. 121.

§. 140. But 8ly. This certainty of Tradition (allowed by Protestants) for Scripture's being God's Word, and whatever is contained in it, infallible, seeming unsufficient to assure to Christians their faith in several Articles thereof, because, wherever the *sence* of these *Scriptures* is ambiguous, it will still be uncertain, whether such Articles of our faith be grounded on the *true* sence, which only is God's Word, or on the *mistaken* sence, which is not so. Next, therefore, Catholicks proceed farther yet: And, *both from the same Scriptures* (thus established), *and from other constant Tradition descending from the Apostles* (for which see the proofs given before Disc. 1. §. 7.— Disc. 2. §. 17. & Disc. 3. §. 7.— 87. &c.) *do also gather and firmly believe an* infallibility *in the* Church, *or its* Governours, *for all* necessaries *from a promised perpetual assistance of the holy Ghost.* And this Article of the *infallibility* of the *Church* thus established becomes to them a new ground of their faith, from which they do most firmly believe, and adhere to all the rest of those Articles of their faith, wherein the Divine Revelation either of Scriptures or Tradition is not so perspicuous and clear to them, as it is in this other of the Churches infallibility: And from this infallibility of the Church believed, all the definitions of the same Church, that are made in points where the true sence of Scriptures is in controversie, and that are delivered by her as infallible, and Divine, Revelations, are straight believed as such; and, among others, these points also, (when the Church defines them, in any doubtful case) what belongs to the *Canon of Scriptures*, or, what are *Traditions Apostolical.*

§. 141. Thus, if I first receive, and believe the Church-infallibility from a clear Apostolical Tradition; afterward, from this Church-infallibility defining it, I may become straight assured of the Canon of Scripture. Or 2ly. If I receive, and believe some part of the Canon of Scripture from clear Apostolical Tradition, and out of this received Canon become assured of Church-infallibility, afterward from this infallibility defining it, I may certainly come to know other parts of the same Canon that are more questioned. Again: when I have already learned the Church-infallibility from the Scriptures, afterward I may become, from its definitions, setled in the belief of all those Articles of faith, wherein the expressions of the same Scriptures (though believed by me before the Churches infallibility, yet) being ambiguous in their sence, (which sence properly, and not the words, is the Divine Revelation) can beget no certain, and firm faith in me, until they are expounded by the Church infallibly relating, from God's Spirit assisting it, the traditive sence of them to me. So that, though I believe the infallibility

of

of Scripture's as well as the Church; yet, in so many points, wherein the meaning of the Scriptures is not clear to me, I receive the firmness of my faith in them, not from the infallibility of the Scriptures expression of that which is God's Word, but of the Church expounding them. If then the Scripture, or Tradition-Apostolick, be clearer for this of Church-infallibility, than for some other points of faith, that person must necessarily be conceded to have a firmer ground of his faith for so many points, who believes the *Church infallible*, than another, who believes only *Scripture* so; and such person also is preserved in a right faith in these points, when the other not only may err in his *Faith*, but become *heretical* in his error, by opposing the definition of the Church. So, had the *Arrians*, and *Nestorians* believed the *Church infallible*, this Article of their faith, firm and stedfast, had preserved them from *Heresie* in some others.

§. 142.

Here then appears a great firmness and stability of the *Catholicks* Faith, by reason of this Church-infallibility, for many points, wherein the *Protestants* faith fluctuates, and varies. For whilst the Protestant only extends, and makes use of, the certitude of the *Church-Tradition*, as to one of these points, the *delivery* of the *Scriptures*; and acknowledgeth no further certitude of the same Church-Tradition, written (in the Scriptures), or unwritten, for the other point, the *infallibility* of the *Church* divinely assisted, in the exposition of the same Scriptures, and in the discerning of true Traditions; And again, while the sence of these Scriptures in many weighty points (as experience shews) hath been, and is controverted; the *Protestant* here, for so many of these points, as are, upon such misinterpretation of Scripture, defined by the Church (in the definition of which Church, assisted (as he believes) by the holy Ghost, the Catholick remains secure), hath no rational Anchor, nor ground of confidence in his faith, but that which rests upon the certainty of his own judgment concerning the *sence* of God's Word, and *truth* of Tradition; and that judgment of his too, for several points of his faith, going against the judgment, and exposition of the *major* part of the present Church, and against his *Superiors*. Where the last refuge Protestants betake themselves to ordinarily, is this, that they say —In all things necessary the sence of Scripture is not ambiguous, but clear enough to the unlearned; and that in points not necessary, there is no necessity of a right faith, or of any decision of controversies; and so no need of an *infallible Church*, or any *unerring* Guide, save *Scripture*, which defence hath been examined, in Disc. 2. §. 38. &c.

§. 143. The sum of what hath been said here, is this.

1ᴿᵉ. I take it as a principle agreed on: That a *divine* is such a faith, as, *quatenus* divine, ultimately resolves it self into *Divine Revelation.*

§. 144. 2ˡʸ. There must be some particular ultimate *Divine Revelation* assigned by every Christian (which may be not to all the same, but to some one, to some another) beyond which he can resolve his divine faith no further, and for proving or confirming which Revelation, he can produce no other divine Revelation; but there must end; unless a process be made in *infinitum*, or a running round. [‘ *Fides divina discursiva esse non potest circa omnia objecta sua, quia* ‘ *alioquin sequeretur processus in infinitum.* Layman (p. 181.) quoting ‘ *Caietan*, in 22. q. 1. art. 1. —*Si dicas: assentio huic* [revelato] ‘ *ex fide acquisitâ; tunc fides infusa dependeret in esse & in faciendo ad-* ‘ *hærere alicui articulo à fide acquisitâ, sicut à principio, Scotus* l. 1. 23. d. §. *contra fid.*]

§. 145. 3ˡʸ. Concerning such ultimate particular Divine Revelation (whether it be authority, and veracity of Scripture; or authority and veracity, of the Church; or of Apostolical Tradition; or of miracles); If we say further, that we ground our divine faith of it upon God's veracity, or because God is true, and cannot lye, (an undisputable prime principle): Yet note, that *God's veracity* alone is not a sufficient ground of such faith of any particular Revelation: (since on this veracity of God in general many false Religions also are pretended to be grounded; *i. e.* many false Religions believe, that whatever God saith is true; and further believe, but falsely; that God hath said, what they are taught), unless another proposition be joyned with it, *viz.* that God who is, thus, True, and cannot lye in whatever he saith, hath also said this particular thing which we believe (namely, that the testimony of the Church, or Apostles, or Scriptures, our particular ultimate ground, named before, is true). [Of which thus Card. *Lugo* † —‘ *Duplex est* ‘ *ratio, formalis partialis, cui ultimò fides* [divina] *nititur.* 1. *Deus* ‘ *est prima veritas: Et* 2. *Deus ita dixit*: and we know, the certitude ‘ of any Conclusion must alwayes be built on two premises, or prin- ‘ ciples] And then, letting the first pass unquestioned, *Deus est prima veritas*; the second, that *God hath said this* or that, must either be grounded (that it may be the foundation of a divine faith) on some other Divine Revelation, from which we collect that he hath said it; (which still will proceed to the inquiry after another divine Revelation, on which to ground that), or else I must rest there, with an immediate assent to it; and acknowledge, that I have no divine faith, that he hath said it, which relyes on any other Divine Reve-

† *De virtute fidei divin. Disp.* 1. §. 7.

Revelation: and then, why might I not have rested as well in the forenamed Revelations? Lastly, concerning that Divine Revelation, which, by due consequences, seems to be the ultimate resolvent of a Christian faith; those, who disallow that, which others assign; let them assign another, such as is truly a Divine Revelation, and not mistaken only by them to be so, (as assigning the letter of Scripture taken by them in a wrong sence, *&c.*) and it sufficeth.

§. 146.

4ly. I take this also for agreed on by all; that the internal efficient of all faith *divine* is the *power*, or *grace* of the *Holy Spirit* both * illuminating the understanding, that the prime verity cannot lye in whatever thing it reveals (if perhaps the understanding herein needeth any light); and also, that the particular Articles of our faith are its Revelations. * And perswading, and operating in the will such a firm adherence unto these Articles, as many times far exceeds that of any humane science, or demonstrations.

§. 147.

5ly. Now then; If any Christian be asked, concerning the ultimate Resolution of his *divine* faith, as to the *extrinsecal* prime motive, ground, reason, or principle thereof, that equals in certainty the faith built on it, he can alledge none other, than that particular divine Revelation, which is first made known to him (by what means it matters not, since this varies as to several persons), or from which, in building of his faith, he proceeds to the rest. Again, if any ask, concerning the *internal* efficient of such *faith* as is *divine*; the answer must alwayes be one and the same, for the divine faith of all Christians, That it is wrought in the faithful by the *grace* of the holy Spirit.

§. 148.

6ly. The *Motives*, forementioned, which are such a rational evidence of the verity of Christianity, and of the several Articles thereof believed in the Catholick Church, as no other forreign Religion or Sect in Christianity can produce, do serve indeed antecedently for an *introductive* to, or (after it introduced) for a *confirmative* of this divine faith; *i. e.* to make it credible, or acceptable to *humane reason* (my own, or others), that this faith is true, and no way liable to error; that I am assured in it by the Holy, and no seducing, spirit: But not to constitute it in the notion of *faith divine*; because the faith so stiled is supposed to rest alwayes on an higher ground, viz. *Revelation Divine.*

§. 149.

And by what hath been here said, I think you may perceive the circle clearly avoided, (which is still so hotly charged on Catholicks, though not for the resolution of their faith *in general*, which resteth in the last place on the *prudential motives*; yet, for the resolution at least of the *divine* faith, they pretend to). For, if a Protestant

ſtant ask at large: why I believe (without inſerting, with a divine faith) the Scriptures to be the Word of God? It is anſwered; becauſe *Apoſtolical Tradition*, which is the unwritten, Word of God, or Divine Revelation, (a thing conceded by the Arch-Bp. †) teſtifies it to be ſo. Again, if asked; why I believe, there was any ſuch Apoſtolical Tradition? I anſwer; becauſe the *Church*, which I believe in this matter infallible, or not erring, delivers ſuch Tradition to me: And if it be asked again, why I believe the Church infallible in this? It is anſwered; I believe her (but this is by an acquiſite faith) to be ſo, from the motives of credibility, forementioned, † which do ſo perſwade me. (But note, that this acquiſite faith is not a neceſſary prerequiſite to every one, that believes with a divine faith; for, as *Layman* † *Non omnes eodem modo, ſed alii aliter ad fidem Chriſti amplectendam moventur*—And as *Eſtius* before † —— *Fidei impertinens eſt, quo medio Deus utatur ad conferendum homini donum fidei*); and in all this, Proteſtants confeſs, there is no Circle †.

† p. 81.

† §. 121.

† *Theol. moral. l. 2. tract. 1. c. 5.*

† *See* §. 129.

† *See Stillingf.* p. 126.

§. 150. But, if now, putting in the word *Divine*, the Proteſtant † ask me again the two former queſtions: why with a *divine* faith I believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God? and then, upon the former anſwer returned, ask me why 2ly. with a *divine* faith (*i. e.* with ſuch a firm aſſent as I give thereto, tranſcending that of an acquiſite faith) I do believe, that, which the Church relates (or, ſuppoſe I have it only from my Paſtor, that which he relates) as *Apoſtolical Tradition*, to be ſo indeed; I anſwer now, that I *finally* reſt on this Revelation, without having any other whereon to ground it. But if asked, why ſo firmly, and (if I may ſo ſay) divinely, without any further divine evidence, I adhere to it? I anſwer from the *internal operation*, and teſtimony of the *Holy Spirit*; which Spirit cauſeth a moſt firm fiducial aſſent in me; that theſe Scriptures were delivered to the Church, as God's Word, by Apoſtolical Tradition; (for the Church pretends no new Revelation concerning the Canon of Scripture) *i. e.* were delivered by thoſe divinely preſerved from any fallibility therein. Neither doth here again, in the matter of *divine* faith, appear any Circle at all. And, if it be further asked; what *rational* ground I have to think this is a perſwaſion of God's, and not of ſome evil ſpirit? or, this indeed an Apoſtolical Tradition which I am told is ſo? here I urge for theſe, the prudential motives.

† *Id* p. 127.

§. 151. Again: Suppoſe I be asked concerning ſome other *Article* of *faith* that is defined by the Church, though the ſame Article doth not appear *to me* clearly delivered in the Scriptures; why, with a *divine* faith, I do believe it to be divine Revelation? I anſwer, becauſe

cauſe the *Church*, which is revealed by the Scriptures to be perpetually aſſiſted by the holy Ghoſt, and to be infallible for ever in matters of faith defined by her, hath delivered it to me, as ſuch. If again; why, with a *divine* faith, I believe theſe *Scriptures* in general, or ſuch a ſence of thoſe *Texts* in particular, which are pretended to reveal the Churches infallibility, to be divine Revelation? I anſwer as before, becauſe *Apoſtolical Tradition* hath delivered them to be ſo; which Apoſtolical Tradition (related, or conveyed to me by the Church,) I believe with a divine faith by the internal operation of the Holy Spirit, without having at all any further Divine Revelation, from which I ſhould believe this Revelation to be divine. Or if any will go one ſtep further, and prove this Apoſtolical Tradition alſo divine from the divine works the Apoſtles did, *Miracles*; yet here he muſt conclude; neither have we any further divine word, or work, to confirm to us their doing ſuch divine works. But then; if I be asked further; whether I do not believe, with a *divine* faith, the *Church's relation*, concerning ſuch *Apoſtolical Tradition*, or *Miracles*, to be infallible, I (excluding now this ſuppoſition, which in the order of theſe queſtions is in this place to be excluded, *viz.* that *Scriptures* are the Word of God; and ſo excluding this anſwer, that I believe the Churches relation infallible with a divine faith, from the teſtimony which the Scriptures give to the Church). Here I anſwer: No, I do not believe with divine faith this relation of the Church to be infallible; for divine faith builds upon nothing but Divine Revelation; and, if I were to bring another Divine Revelation ſtill to ſupport my faith of the former, ſo muſt I alſo bring yet a further Divine Revelation for this my believing the Church, and here muſt needs be a proceſs *in infinitum*. But in this place I anſwer: That I believe the Churches Tradition, or teſtimony (being taken here in the latter ſence mentioned before §. 126) infallible only with an humane, and acquiſite faith builded on the forenamed prudential motives; and the ultimate reſolution here of my *divine* faith is into *Apoſtolical Tradition*, or their *Miracles*, not the *Church-Tradition*, or her Relation, that conveys to me the Apoſtolical: With a divine faith I do believe the Apoſtolical Tradition related by the Church; but I do believe the Church her truly, or infallibly (I mean, not as infallibly here relates to the divine Promiſe, but to the prudential Motives) relating this Apoſtolical Tradition, with an *acquired*, or *rational* faith.

§. 152. ‘The natural order of a Chriſtians belief, then, ſeems to ‘be this. 1ſt. The Divine Revelations are communicated to ‘the world by certain perſons, choſen by God, and, for the confir‘mation of their miſſion from him, doing Miracles; which perſons

'also are commanded by God to ordain others to divulge, and per-
'petuate the knowledge of the same Revelations to mankind to the
'end of the world; the chief body of which, these persons also draw
'up, and deliver in writing. Of which Divine Revelations deliver-
'ed by them, this is one; That these their Successors shall for ever
'be so far assisted by God's holy Spirit, as never to err in teaching
'all truths, (or, if you will, in truly relating all Divine Revelations)
'any way necessary to mens salvation; which Divine Revelation
'also concerning themselves is (as it ought to be) delivered among
'the rest to all posterity, by these very Successors, of whom it is
'spoken. These things thus conveyed; those to whom these Re-
'velations are made, do, 1. with a *rational* and *acquisite* faith, be-
'lieve the Tradition of these Successors of the Apostles; who are
'rendred most credible to them, by all those prudential motives men-
'tioned before §. 121. their *multitude*, their *sanctity*, their *Martyrdoms*,
'in testimony thereof &c. 2. But then, applying themselves to the
'things related, which are said to have been revealed and delivered
'first by God to persons assisted with most infallible Miracles, they
'do believe these things related, after the manner expressed before
'§ 134. with yet an *higher*, and a *divine*, faith; wrought in them by
'the holy Spirit; and resting it self, not on the veracity of these
'secondary Relators, but on the veracity of God himself, from
'whom these Revelations are said originally to come; (yet the ra-
'tional introductive to all this faith being the veracity of those, who
'immediately convey the Tradition of these things to them.)
' 3. Then, further; one of the Divine Revelations, which the
'Church, or these Successors do deliver to Christians (as I said)
'being this; That these Successors of the Apostles, who deliver
'their doctrine to us, shall be for ever infallible in delivering all
'necessaries; from this Revelation, (I say) delivered by them,
'Christians also believe the infallibility of this Church, or of these
'Successors not by a *rational* faith only, grounded on the former
'motives of credibility; but by a *divine* faith, because grounded
'on a divine Revelation; and consequently, believe also all things,
'delivered by these persons as necessaries, with a *divine* faith, on
'the same account.]

§. 153. After all this, to reflect now a little on the objection. We see. 1st. That no *Circle* is made in a *Catholicks* ground or resolution of faith, *divine*, or *acquisite*; but that there is an *ultimate Revelation* divine (though this not necessary to be alwayes the same) whereon divine faith resteth, and into which, and no humane motives, it resolveth it self; and an *inward operation* of God's *Spirit*, whereby the firmness of adherence of this faith to such Revelation

lation in particular as divine, is effected. And again, that these are *motives* from humane authority sufficiently credible, or also *morally infallible*; (or, as some of late express themselves, *not-possibly-fallible*: which if they can prove, whenas it is in the natural power of all men, even taken collectively, abstracting here from any divine superintendencies, to tell a lye, none have reason to envy any advancing of the evidences of Christian Religion, or any part thereof: But, here, seems no necessity of pretending any other infallibility in these motives, than Catholick writers have formerly maintained, and the adversary also allows) on which an *acquired*, or *humane* faith securely resteth; these motives carrying such an *evidence* with them, as no other Religion differing from the Christian, nor in Christianity any Sect divided from the Catholick Communion, can upon any rational account, equall.

2ly. That the *infallibility* of the *Church*, grounded on divine Revelation, and believed by a divine faith, is a main ground, and pillar of the *Catholicks* faith for any other Articles thereof, that are established by the same Churches definitions, where the *Scriptures*, or *Tradition Apostolick*, are to him (but I say not the Church) doubtful. Of which ground and assurance of such points, (believed by Catholicks from the Church's infallible authority), the Protestants faith is destitute.

3ly. That the faith of all such Articles, grounded thus on the Church's infallible authority; is (by this) grounded also on divine Revelation.

'Where note: That resolving faith into the Church's infalli-'bility (I mean, as the Church is declared thus infallible in necessa-'ries by God's Word, or divine Revelation, whether written, the 'Scriptures, or unwritten, Tradition Apostolical,) or into Apo-'stolical Tradition, or into Scripture is in general all one, and the 'same, resolution, *i. e.* into divine Revelation; and ultimately is on-'ly believing a thing, because God saith it: *saith it*, in the Scrip-'tures; or (also out of them) by his Apostles; or by the Church 'succeeding the Apostles; *by it*, I say, as declared by God's Word 'to be also infallibly assisted, truly to relate, and expound, what the 'Apostles, or Scripture have *formerly* said: where still the resolu-'tion of faith is into the same infallible Word of God delivered by 'these; and not into any proper authority, or infallibility of the 'deliverer; and when we say we resolve our faith into the infallibi-'lity of the present Church, or of the Apostles, we mean into 'Gods infallible Word delivered mediately by the one, or immedi-'ately by the other. And whilst, to one that asketh me, why I 'believe the Scriptures, I answer, because those, who wrote them,

'were assisted by God's Spirit to deliver to men those divine Revelations; And again, to one that asketh me, why I believe the 'Church, I answer, because the Church is for ever assisted by the 'same Spirit of God faithfully to *relate*, and *expound* these former 'divine Revelations delivered by those who wrote the Scriptures in 'all necessary matter of faith: Here it is clear, that if one of these 'resolutions be into divine Revelation imparted, and communicated 'to man by God's Spirit, so must the other; though the manner of 'conveying them to us by the assistance of God's Spirit, is different; as is explained before §. 109. And had the New Testament Scriptures not been writ, (as they might have been not written without nullifying the being of Christian Religion), then all 'the resolution of the Articles of our faith would have been only 'into the unwritten testimony of the Apostles; and from them, of 'the Church following them; to which Church for ever (though 'without any testimony of Scripture) the same promises must be 'supposed to have been made (for the writing of these Scriptures, 'surely, was no cause of these promises): And next, these promises might also have been made known to Christians by Tradition 'Apostolical, related only by the Church: and consequently the 'same credence must have been given to this Tradition Apostolical 'related by the Church, concerning such promises made to it; as is 'now given to the Scriptures, testifying it.'

4ly. Yet that this Church-infallibility, or that Divine Revelation which establisheth it, is not necessarily the first, or the ultimate, divine Revelation, into which every Catholick's faith, concerning any particular point of his belief is necessarily resolved; for the divine faith of several persons, concerning particular points, may have a various resolution, as they come, by divers wayes, or from divers principles, to believe it; and one Article of faith may be *savingly* believed, without the present knowledge, or belief of another, whereon it hath dependance: as one may believe, with a divine faith, either the Scripture's, or the Church's infallibility from Apostolical Tradition, one before the other, as they happen to be first proposed to them: (of which see what is said before §. 128. 145.) and by the certainty of his Faith grounded thereon, attain eternal salvation. And blessed be his Divine Majesty for so firmly establishing Christianity one these two sure Bases, *the Scriptures*, and *the Church*. For both are *Pillars of Truth* †, and both alwayes bear witness, as to it, so also to one another. And what thou hast thus joyned, O Lord, let no man be able to separate; nor the Gates of Hell, ever so far prevail against them, as that any should

† 1 Tim. 3. 15.

prosper

prosper in their indeavours to build the Authority of the one out of the ruines of the other. Amen.

§. 154. *The Conclusion.*

Thus much be said concerning the necessary Resolution of a Catholick's Faith; and in satisfaction to those other objections that are urged against a *living Ecclesiastical infallible guide in all necessaries*, maintained in the former Discourses, and affirmed also easily discernable from all other Pretenders. After all which, in the last place, the Protestant Reader is humbly desired soberly to consider with himself: whether, if indeed there be such a *Catholick* unfailing *Guide* as is here pretended, and *that Church* also, whose conduct he hath renounced, be It, whom our Lord hath left, amidst the distractions of so many Sects and Opinions, to bring men by a sure way to Heaven; whether, I say, notwithstanding all those reasons and arguments, that have been here, and are elsewhere, by Catholicks frequently urged in demonstration thereof, yet, his ignorance thereof still remains so innocent, and invincible, that he dares rely on this Plea, at the appearance of our Lord, for his living and dying irreconciled unto Her, because no sufficient evidence hath been left him to discern Her. And, next, to consider; whether, if indeed she be, what here she is pretended, there can be any secular interest so valuable, as any way to recompence the loss he sustains, in his present separation from this Church, by foregoing all that means of salvation, and growth in grace, and advantages of an holy life, which he might, with great spiritual content, enjoy in her happy bosom. Of which advantages, because they are by few of those departed from this Church so well weighed as they ought, for a conclusion of the whole, I beg leave (not to stay only in universals, but) to represent some particulars, to the begetting in Him (by the aid of the Divine Grace), an holy emulation, and longing, for the re-fruition of them, and a greater resentment of his present impediments, and defects.

§. 155.

Let him then, in the name and fear of God, consider the great benefit, as to the working of his salvation, which he might happily enjoy in this Church, by these particulars following. * By her daily celebrated Sacrifice of the *Altar*, and the so often renewed *corporal presence* of our *Lord* in the holy *Eucharist*, and the most acceptable opportunity of the presentation of his requests, and opening of his necessities at this time—*Quando in manibus est hostia*, (to use **S.** *Chrysostom's* words †) *adsunt Angeli, adsunt Archangeli, adest Filius Dei—Dum mors illa perficitur, & horrendum Sacrificium, & ineffabilia Sacramenta* [&] *quasi, sedente Rege, quacunque quis voluerit, perficit.* * By the *suffrages* of the *Saints*, (here) so honourably

† *In Act. Hom.* 21.

rably commemorated, and their interceſſions ſo frequently implored. * By the frequent examining, and purging of his conſcience by *Sacramental Confeſſion*, and the prudent advices of his *Ghoſtly Father*, and a frequent participation of the *holy Communion*; the uſe whereof, with many more devoutly pious Sons of the Church, is almoſt quotidian. * By thoſe many excellent *Rules*, and other *means*, which this Church, in a ſingular, and tranſcendent manner to any other Chriſtian Society, preſcribes to, and provides for, him, for eradicating former habits of ſin, getting the maſtery of his own will, and paſſions, mortifying carnal luſts, and worldly ambitions, acquiring, and, preſerving Chriſtian virtues, and attaining perfection.

§. 156. Such as are, * Her ſpecial recommendation, of frequent, and long *Faſts*, of *Abſtinences* from pleaſant food; of *Retirement*, *Cloiſters*, and *ſolitude*; of *Celibacy* (to the perſons well prepared to receive it, as all may be, if they will), *ut ſint ſine ſollicitudine*, 1 Cor. 7. 32. of voluntary *Poverty* (I mean the poſſeſſion only of a neceſſary livelyhood); and of a reſigned *Obedience* (I mean in all lawful things only) to the will of a diſcreet *Superior*. * Her recommending ſo highly *corporal Mortifications*, as moſt profitable for the cure of all diſeaſes of the ſoul, and for planting in it true humility, and ſelf-denial; ſuch as are, *mean fare*, *hard lodging*, *courſe apparel*, *hair-cloth*, *diſciplines*, *watchings*, &c. And her enjoyning the abſtinence from many things lawful, for preventing of actions unlawful. * Her accurate ſtudying the diſeaſes of the Soul, and weighing the ſeveral degrees, and malignities of *ſins*, carefully ſevering thoſe which give *mortal* wounds from thoſe that bring ſlighter hurts; and preſcribing to her Penitents great diverſity of medicinal *penances*, as one or other may more conduce to the removal of them, and to the producing a future compleat Reformation. * Her excellent directions in *myſtical Theology*, and the practice of *mental* and *vocal Prayer* for attaining Recollection, and a cloſer union with God; and her moſt prudent conduct, of the illiterate having but few prayers by heart, and not able to help themſelves by Books, in a frequent *repetition* of them to ſeveral particular pious intentions, and eſpecially their calling to mind the ſeveral *myſteries* of our *Redemption*, ſo to continue theſe perſons, alſo, in a conſtant devotion. * Her diligent preſcribing choice ſubjects, and Heads, and wayes of *Meditation*, and amongſt theſe eſpecially thoſe of the poor, and humble life, the great and ſilent ſufferings, and the painful, and patient death of our *bleſſed Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*, propoſed as a perfect pattern of inheriting future glory by preſent humility and ſufferings; to which all, as much

much as may be, ought to conform: And next; the reading of the holy *Lives* of his *Saints*, in which she abounds, and furnisheth her Subjects, incomparably beyond any other Christian Society. *The high value she sets upon, and necessity she urgeth, of an inherent *Sanctity*; of the practice of Christian *virtues*; and of *good works*; especially those of *Almsdeeds*, mercy, and charity to our neighbour, (in so much that some of her adversaries say, but untruly, that she intrusts salvation more upon our own merits, than our Lord's): of which works her publick benefactions shew great variety, beyond any other Sects, extending to all the wants of humane life; she instituting also several *Societies*, or *Fraternities*, who relieve with their charities, or instruct and comfort with their learning and advice; or fortifie with the Sacraments; or tend with their persons, those, who seem the greatest spectacles of misery, and objects of pitty. *Her zealous vindicating the powerful effect of our Lord's Redemption, as to the future *observing* of all his *Laws*; and the ability, which the Grace of the holy Ghost, purchased by him, confers on all the regenerate, to walk henceforth in all the Commandements of God blameless, as to mortal sin. And her proposing an infinite variety, and *degrees*, of the future celestial *reward*, one much greater and higher than another, and all distributed according to the degrees of a Christian perfection here; no extraordinary service losing its just wages, and who sows plentifully, so reaping: thereby encouraging her Sons to undertake difficult matters for the service of his Divine Majesty, and to attempt the observance of the highest Rules of perfection; and imitation of the greatest Saints. And her prescribing many useful lessons, and Documents for the attaining, and preserving of all *Christian virtues*; These, with the several mysteries of our Redemption, being the chief Subject of her publick Discourses, wherein she indeavours to render her Sons, not only purged from sin, but perfect in love.

*Her most careful assistance of all her children at their last hour with the help of her *Sacraments*; cleansing them with *Confession*; and exciting acts of Contrition; arming them with the sacred *Viaticum*, and other Sacraments; and then, following them with her *Prayers*, and *Oblations* into the next world; that thus they may, in all manners, participate the benefits of the Communion of Saints. *Her great care to preserve an *holy Clergy*; enjoyning them *Celibacy*, the more to free them from secular incumbrances; *Ut non sint divisi — & Dominum obsecrent sine impedimento* †, and a daily long *Divine Service*, ordinarily indispensable, distributed into several *hours*, to keep them as it were in a continuall colloquy with God, and to pay him, for mankind, a daily tribute of Praise: enjoyned

† 1 Cor. 7. 33, 35.

joyned also a frequent (*i.e.* at least on all Sundayes, and solemn Festivals) oblation of the Evangelical *Sacrifice*, and participation of the holy *Communion*, (prepared so often also for any others, that hunger after this daily Bread): things, which it were a great crime for such persons to do, when living in any mortal sin: And her linking them also together by a most *regular subordination*, and strict *obedience*, to retain them unanimous in all things she prescribes; and so to derive upon them, and her self, the blessings of unity, and peace.

* Her prudent *distribution* of the *Circle* of the *Year*, in her publick Liturgy, as it were into a continual meditation of the chief mysteries of our Redemption, lengthning the more solemn *Festivals* therof with *Octaves*, & furnishing them with a service closely applyed to the season, and adorned with *Lections* out of the *Fathers*, *Hymns*, *Antiphons*, *Responsories*, proper to the solemnity (which great Festivals are, elsewhere, ordinarily passed over only with Scripture Lections, and a short Collect, and the service of one single day). Next: for a more worthy preparation to the receit of those Graces, which our Lord in the foresaid mysteries hath procured for us, *Her assigning another part of this year for *a time of Humiliation*, and Confession (as the holy time of *Advent*, and of *Lent*) fitted with a constant service suitable to the Exercise, in those times, of a godly sorrow, and Contrition; Those of her Sons, who are lovers of piety, thus spending some part of this Ecclesiastical year in a spiritual joy, Hymns, Prayers, and Thanksgivings: another, in Litanies, Fastings, Tears, and sundry penitential devotions. *Her receiving several *Books* of *Scripture* as *Canonical* and Divine, and so requiring of all her Sons a suitable observance and obedience thereto, which others degrade, extenuate and reject: And, whilst they pretend the holy Bible their only Rule of Faith, yet are the persons also, who most abridge it. *Her studying likewise all the wayes how to preserve these *Divine Oracles* in a most sacred reverence and esteem; and unviolated by the private and undigested interpretations and glosses of the vulgar and unlearned; the true sence of which, together with the letter she takes care that they should receive from the mouths of their spiritual *Pastors* and *Teachers*, so to keep the most infirm steady in an Orthodox faith. * Her entertaining also & vindicating several *writings* of the *Fathers* as Genuine, and *Councils* as obligatory, whereby the doctrine both of Christian Faith and manners is much fortified and promoted, of which writings and decrees, others, whilst they question the Authority, lose the Benefit. * Her many external expressions of *honour*, and *reverence* to all things, which any way more nearly relate to *God*, and his *Saints*, partly to elevate her devotions to them, partly to excite

the

the memory, and imitation of them; whilſt others, not knowing theſe natural effects of this divine love, ſtile ſuch her affection, ſuperſtition. * The holy *Example*, ſhining before others, of many of both ſexes within her Communion, treading under their feet all ſecular pleaſures, contents, and ambitions; and ſhewing the higheſt precepts, and Councils of this Church practiceable: eſpecially thoſe examples of ſeveral *Religious Orders* (living under various Rules of a ſingular devotion, fitted for all ſorts, and conditions, and drawn up by perſons endued with a divine prudence, joyned with a long experience): By whoſe eminent ſanctity, conſpicuous to all, is ſufficiently removed any prejudice to the holy doctrine, and diſcipline of this Church, raiſed from the vicious lives of ſome others, the undutiful Sons of a moſt pious Mother.

If then, I ſay, all theſe advantages of attaining ſalvation, and of increaſe of grace, are found to be, in ſuch a ſingular manner, promoted in this Church as not in any other, ſo that, as ſhe only pretends to be the infallible Guide, ſo ſhe only ſeems worthy to be ſo, let him conſider what precious helps he loſeth, in not rendring himſelf (perhaps for ſome trifling ſecular reſpects) in all things her obedient Diſciple. And, in the midſt of ſuch reſigned thoughts, may the good Lord, the only *Teacher* of *hearts*, ſo open his, that, amongſt the many paths, by ſeveral Sects with equal zeal propoſed, he may make an happy choice of that, which may moſt ſurely conduct him to eternal happineſs, and be moſt acceptable to the Divine Majeſty: To whoſe Patronage and Benediction, the Author humbly commits theſe his labours, well conſidering — *That none can do any thing againſt the Truth, but for the Truth* † — And — *That whatever Council or work is not of God, ſhall come to naught* * — *That an Woe is to all thoſe that call good evil, and evil good* † — And — *He accurſed, that makes the blind to wander out of the way* *; and therefore aſſureth his pious Reader, that he would not wittingly take this paines, only to inherit to himſelf the malediction due to a Seducer, and to become anſwerable to God for the loſs of his Soul; or, for any other end, ſave that, of advancing God's glory, in his eternal Felicity. And if any ſhall hereafter deſigne a confutation of theſe Diſcourſes, he alſo is deſired firſt to take into his thoughts the ſame Meditations: leaſt perhaps learning, or wit, or ſome ſecular intereſt, ſhould prevail with him, either to write thoſe things to perſwade others, which do not perſwade himſelf; or to believe and perſwade himſelf thoſe things, which oppoſe an apparent Truth, if he were diveſted

† 2 Cor. 13. 8.
* Act. 5. 38.
† Eſay 5. 20.
* Deut. 27. 18.

of some inordinate passions and prejudices clouding his judgment. For we may presume, from such an heavy curse laid on false Guides, that, though an utterly irresistible evidence of Truth, in Divine matters, must not be expected, which would lessen the merit of our Faith; yet so sufficient a manifestation thereof is left us by our good Lord, as will render the learned, when opposing it, unexcused. To Him, the Fountain of all Truth, and faithful Protector of his Church, be all Honour, and Glory for ever. Amen.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

A supplement to the fourth Chapt. 26. §. precedent. Wherein is shewed a consent of the Doctrine and Practice of the modern Eastern Churches with the Occidental, in the chief Points of present Controversie. [1. *Transubstantiation*, §. 158. n. 2. & 177. 2. *Adoration of the Eucharist*, §. 159, 177. 3. *Sacrifice of the Mass* §. 160. n. 1.—& 177. 4. *Invocation of Saints* §. 161. 5. *Prayer for the souls of the departed, as betterable, hereby, in their present condition*, §. 162. 6. *Communion in one kind, or intinct, only*, §. 163, 178. 7. *A relative veneration of Images, or Pictures*, Ibid. 8. *Monastick Vows: and marrying denyed the Clergy, after their having taken Holy Orders*, §. 164.—& 179. n. 1. 9. *Auricular or Sacramental Confession*, §. 165, 179. n. 2.] *The Replyes made, hereto, by Protestants considered*, §. 182. *&c.*

IT is affirmed above, *Cap.* 4. §. 26. that the great points of modern Controversie, §. 158. n. 1.

[1. *Transubstantiation*, or a substantial Conversion of the Elements into Christs Body. *(a)*

2. *Adoration* of the *Eucharist*; i. e. of Christ's body, and blood, as present in it; which follows from the former. *(b)*

3. The *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*; not only that of *Prayers*, *Praise*, and *Thanksgiving*; nor only of the *Mysteries* offered, in the consecration of them, as a commemoration of the passion (conceded also by learned Protestants); but also of the very *Body* and *Blood* of Christ in these Mysteries, (which follows from the first point) offered in this service, (as a commemorative, and applicative of the virtue and merit of the same Body and Blood offered on the Cross), *pro vivis, & defunctis.* *(c)*

4. *Invocation* of the *Blessed Virgin*, and *Saints.* *(d)*

And 5. Such *prayer*, for the *dead*, as infers their present condition before the day of Judgment (whatever their restraint, or sufferings be) conceived betterable by the Intercessions of the living, *(e)*]

Do clearly appear to have been universally held, and practised, and the approbation, and conformity to them imposed, by the Ecclesiastical Governours both of the *Eastern*, and *Western* Church, at the

appearance of *Luther*. Which remains here a little more fully to be vindicated, and cleared.

§. 158. n 2. (*a*) 1st. A substantial conversion of the Elements, and a corporal presence of our Lords Body and Blood in the Eucharist, as to the Western Church, was in several Councils defined against *Berengarius* †: and, as to the Eastern Church, the modern Greeks are confessed in this point to agree with the Romanists by learned Protestants; * By Dr. *Potter*, p. 225. where affirming a difference between the Roman opinion, and that of the rest of the Catholick Church, as to many other points: yet this particular he excepts from them in this manner—*Unless happily* (saith he) *the opinion of Transubstantiation may be excepted, wherein the latter Greeks seem to agree with the Romanists*, quoting there these their Authors for it; *Nicatæ Thesaur. Orthod.---Euthym. Panoplia.---Hierem.* Patriarch C. P. *in Respons. 1. & 2. ad Lutheranos---Nicol. Episcop. Methon.---Respons. Græc. ad Card. Guis.* * By Bishop *Forbes, de Euchar. l. 1. c. 3. p. 412.*—*Patet* (saith he) *ex Græcis recentioribus (ut alios paulo antiquiores omittam) Nicatæ thesauro Orthod. Euthym. panoplia tit. 21.---Nicolao Methonensi---Semona Gazenzi---Nicolao Cabasila---Marco Ephesio---& Bessarione, qui omnes in suis opusculis* apertissimè Transubstantiationem *confitentur.* [See a collection of the most of them by *Johan. à Sancta Andrea*] *Et in concilio Florentino non fuit quæstio inter Græcos, & Latinos (ut Kemnitius, aliique multi Protestantes affirmant) an panis substantialiter in corpus Christi mutaretur; sed quibusnam verbis illa ineffabilis mutatio fieret; an solis verbis Domini, an verò etiam Sacerdotis, & Ecclesiæ oratione.* * By *Sands West. Rel.* p. 235. and others. And the same *expressions* in the Consecration (which expressions the Protestants thought fit to change, when they changed their opinion), the like *Adoration*, and *Oblation* of these *Mysteries* for the living, and the dead, used in the Greek, as well as Latine service, as also this, that there hath been no Controversie between these two Churches as touching this matter, do sufficiently evidence a concurrence of their doctrine herein.

† *See Disc. 1. §. 57.*

And all the rest of these points also are contained, and apparent, in the former publick Liturgies, and Services as well of the Greek, as of the Latin Church; to which publick Service all those are obliged to conform, who will continue in the Communion of these Churches.

§. 159. (*b*) Concerning the second, a necessary consequent of the first; we read thus in the present form of the Greek Mass—*Dehinc adorat*

adorat Sacerdos, & Diaconus, in quo est loco—Et populus similiter cunctus cum devotione adorat. Cum autem viderit Diaconus Sacerdotem manus extendentem, & sanctum panem tangentem, ut faciat sanctam Elevationem [which Elevation is mentioned also in St *Basils* Liturgy] *exclamat: Attendamus. Et Sacerdos, Sancta sanctis*, &c.—And afterward—*Sacerdos tenens sanctum Calicem vocat Diaconum dicens; Diacone accede. Et Diaconus accedit, & adorat, semel, dicens—Ecce venio ad immortalem regem*, &c.—And again—*Diaconus adorans semel, sumit sanctum Calicem cum veneratione & procedit, &c.* This also is granted by the same Bishop *Forbes de Eucharistia*, p. 442.—That *Græci venetiis viventes, & reliqui etiam Græci omnes adorant Christum in Eucharistiâ; & quis ausit* (saith he) *omnes hos Christianos Idolatriæ arcessere, & damnare?*

(c) Concerning the third. See the solemn performance thereof in the modern Canon of the Greek Mass, as fully, and much what with the like expressions, as in the Roman; for the excluding of which expressions this Canon suffered so great an alteration at the beginning of the Reformation—There we read, in the Mass of S. *Chrysostom*—*Tua ex tuis tibi offerimus per omnia, & in omnibus*—*Offerimus tibi rationalem hunc, & incruentum cultum* [λατρειαν, *in consecrando, & offerendo hanc propitiationis hostiam*; (See *Cyrill. Hierosol. Catec. Mystag.* c. 5. commenting on the Canon of the Mass) *Et supplicamus, emitte Spiritum Sanctum tuum in nos, & in hæc dona proposita—Offerimus tibi rationale hoc obsequium pro his, qui in fide requiescunt; pro Majoribus, Patribus, Patriarchis, &c.* [i. e ut illis proficiat ad honorem]—*pro requie, & remissione animarum servorum tuorum in loco lucido, &c.* [ut illis proficiat ad salutem]—*pro sanctâ Catholicâ, & Apostolicâ Ecclesiâ*, &c.—Again—*Ut clemens Deus noster, qui oblata, & sanctificata pretiosa Dona in sanctum, & supercæleste intellectuale suum altare suscepit in odorem spiritualis suavitatis, nobis divinam gratiam, & sanctissimi spiritus donum rependat, Dominum precemur*—And in the Mass of S. *Basil*—*Memento Domine eorum, qui tibi* hæc dona *obtulerunt, & pro quibus, & per quos, & propter quos* hæc *obtulerunt*—And afterward—*Tu Deus noster, qui hæc dona suscepisti, purga nos ab omni inquinamento carnis, & spiritus, ut puro quidem testimonio conscientiæ nostræ suscipientes partem ἁγιασμάτων σου, Sanctificatorum tuorum* [stiled also there *veneranda, supercœlestia, illibata, vivifica, mysteria*] *uniamur sancto Corpori, & sanguini Christi tui.* And indeed; † Learned Protestants together with the whole Greek and Latine Church, granting the Eucharist to be the Christian, or Evangelical, Sacrifice, not only in respect of the action, in it, of *Praise* and *Thanksgiving*, but also in respect

§. 160 n. 1.

† *Mede Christian Sacrif.* p. 525. 475—*Bp. Bramh. Reply to Chalced.* c. 9. p. 371, 372—*Thorndik. Epilog l.* 3. *c.* 5. p. 46. *&c.*

respect of the *Oblation* to God of the *mysteries*, in the Consecration, as a Commemorative, or Representative, of the Body and Blood of Christ offered on the Cross; * And, next, the Grecian Church being once conceded to agree with the Western in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, or *corporal* presence, (see before §. 158. n. 2.); it necessarily follows, that the Greek Church doth, together with the Western, hold an Oblation made to God in the Eucharist of that very Body and Blood of Christ; *i. e.* do maintain the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*.

§. 161. (*d*) Concerning the fourth: *Multis jam seculis* (saith Bishop Forbes) (*de Invocatione Sanctorum*, p. 321.) *in universâ Ecclesiâ, in Oriente non minùs quam in Occidente, etiam in Aquilone apud Muscovitas, Litania est decantata; ut puta*, Sancte Petre ora pro nobis. And see in the *Officium Exequiarum* (*apud Goar.* p. 325, 528.) — *Quæ sola pura, & illibata virgo Deum absque semine peperisti: intercede, ut ejus anima salvetur — per te vitam invenit hominum Genus; per te paradisum recuperemus* — And — *Agni Dei præcones, &, velut oves mactati, sancti Martyres huic assidue exposcite, simulque nobis, debitorum remissionem donari* — In the Office in time of pestilence (*Goar.* p. 793, 795) — *Vehementibus, & continuis doloribus perculsi, tibi, virgo, cuncti procidimus: potenti tuâ protectione cunctos salva, O pura; miserere Dei sponsa, ab hac pernicie, & morbo gravi nos præserva, & infirmitatibus medere, O Domina* — And — *Agrassantis morbi angustiis, Apostoli, Jesum Dominum, & servatorem deprecantes, nos educite — Martyrum turmæ, sacri Doctores*, &c. *ægrotorum dolores, vestris intercessionibus mitigate, & salutem conferte* — [Some of these too in as high expressions, you see, as those found in the Roman Church. But if we will permit (which is all reason) those, who use such words to expound their meaning, they understand only by them, the Blessed Virgin, & Saint's procuring of God by their intercessions those favours, and mercies, which they ask of them †: nor are they apprehended to preserve, or save people any otherwise, than S. *Paul* did, 1 *Cor.* 9. 22] See *Jeremy* the Constantinopolitan Patriarch in his first answer to the *Lutheran* Divines † — *Ad Dominam nostram, & ad sanctos exclamamus — Per sancta Domina Deipara pro nobis intercede peccatoribus. Omnes sancti Angeli, Apostoli*, &c. *& fœminarum sanctarum catus, orate pro nobis.* That Exposition, therefore, of this Patriarch (which some † make use of to perswade the credulous, as if the Græcian, in the Doctrine of Invocation differed from the Roman, Church) ‖; i. e. [*Invocatio, quæ ad Sanctos fit, non propriè Invocatio fit; sed per accidens (sic dicendo), & per gratiam. Non enim Petrus aut Paulus* [i. e. virtute naturali] *exaudiunt invocatores suos; sed* illa gratia, *quam habent: secundum*

* See Bell. de sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 17. † p. 128.

† See Mr. Stillingf. p. 502.

‖ Hierem. p. 127.

secundum illud quod Dominus dixit: Ero vobiscum usque ad consummationem]: is not thus to be understood; that none of these Saints hear, or at least by some other way know, mens prayers (though as Cardinal *Bellarmine* observes † neither thus could Saint invocation be vain, if others at the least for them heard, and granted their supplicants requests); for the same Patriarch's saying afterward (p. 243.) that it may be many wayes shewed, that the Saints invocated do help, and relieve, doth presuppose also, that they know, mens necessities; and therefore the Lutheran Divines in their Reply endeavour to prove this against him, among other things; that Saints hear not mens prayers: But he meaneth only, that they hear them not *suis viribus naturalibus*, but *per supernaturalem gratiam Dei*, as he explains himself also in his second answer, p. 245. —— *Sanctos multum posse; cum* per gratiam *sint Dii (inquit enim Psalmorum author: Deus stetit in Synagogâ deorum; dignitates scilicet distribuens, ut interpretatur divus Gregorius)*—And—*In suâ vitâ* plenos *fuisse* Spiritus sancti; *atque post funera ipsorum*, ejusdem Spiritus gratiam *non excessisse ex ipsis.*

† *De sanctorum beatitudine. l. 1. c. 20*

(*e*) Concerning the fifth. The Prayers of the Greek Church for the deceased, are not *only* made for remission of sin at the day of judgment, a happy resurrection at that time; glory, life eternal, in the Kingdom of Heaven, &c. *for the person* of the defunct; but also for present remission, rest, light, peace, refreshment, *cum spiritibus justorum consummatis, in sinu Abrahæ, in Paradiso, in loco refrigerii, & lucis, unde dolor, & ærumna, & suspiriuu exulant, &c. for the souls* of the defunct, *viz.* of such defunct (to use the Patriarch's expression †), *Qui, inter pœnitendum, preventi morte fuere; nondum autem peccatorum maculas eluere potuerunt; for rest, and refreshment for them, in sinu Abrahæ*, &c. *i. e.* in the present celestial region of happy souls, imagined inferior to that, they shall inhabit after the day of Judgement. So in the modern Greek Mass it is said—*Offerimus tibi*, &c. *pro requie, & remissione animæ servi tui. N. in loco lucido, à quo abest dolor, & gemitus*—And—*Fac eam quiescere, ubi circumspectat lumen vultus tui.* And in their *Officium exequiarum (apud Goar. p. 525.)*—*Cum spiritibus justis consummatis animæ servi tui salvator da requiem, & in vitam æternam, quæ à te est, custodi illam benigne. In quietu loco, quo sancti tui cuncti residunt, animam servi tui compone Domine, quia tu solus es clemens. Tu Deus es, qui in infernum descendisti, & compeditorum ærumnas solvisti; ipse & animæ servi tui da requiem.*

§. 162.

† *Hieremiæ Patri. primum Resp.* c. 21.

Next; As these *Five* Points were universally held and practised at the coming of *Luther*; so it may seem as clear to any moderate

§. 163.

derate Protestant, that the forenamed Points, together with four more added to them; *viz.* [1] *Communion in one kind.* [2] *Veneration of sacred Images, and Pictures.* [3] *Monastick vows, and Celibacy of the Clergy*; *And* [4] *Auricular, or Sacramental Confession of all mortal sin, and the injunction of due pennances for them*, are the main points in the Roman Church, that are thought to give just offence, and to have necessitated a Reformation. But in these four last also it may easily be shewed, that the Roman Church stands not alone; but, that these points also are (and were at the appearance of *Luther*) the common practice of the Eastern Churches in such a manner, as Protestants disallow, and oppose.

1st. For *Communion* in *one kind*; The modern *Greeks* also are known to communicate the Ecclesiasticks, and the Laicks after a several manner; for they give the *Clergy* the Symbol of Christ's Body into their hands, after which in their order they suck the Blood of our Lord out of the Chalice standing on the Altar, with a pipe; but they communicate the *people* only with the Symbole of Christ's Body intinct in that of his blood, taken out of the Chalice with a little spoon, and so put into their mouths: Not eating therefore, the Body and drinking the blood of our Lord apart, (as, Protestants contend, our Lord not only instituted, but commanded it.) This former way of communicating the people in both kinds having been changed, in both Churches, upon the same ground; namely the many abuses, and irreverences, which have happened in giving the consecrated bread into their hands, and allowing so many Communicants of all ages, and conditions to drink out of the Chalice. Lastly, they communicate the *Sick* only with the Symbol of Christ's Body, consecrated on *Maunday Thursday*, for all the year following; and then, on that day, besprinkled with the Symbol of his blood, and softned again for the sick with common wine at the time, when they administer it †. Such is their practice; whilst both East and West, together with the ancient Church, do hold Christ to be totally present, and so also totally exhibited, in any one species.

† *See Goars* Εὐχολογ. p. 149, 150. *S. Chrysost. Mass. See below* §. 170.

2ly. A *Relative veneration* of the *Cross*, and of *sacred Images* or at least of *Pictures* (which is the same) is also a known practice of the Greek Church, and a macter defined lawful in the second *Nicen*, entertained by the present Greek Church as the seventh General, *Council.*

3ly. As to *Monastick vows*, and *Celibacy of the Clergy*. 1st. It cannot be denyed; but that the Eastern Churches do, and have alwayes held lawful and used, these vows; and abounded with Monasteries, as well as the Western. 2ly. Amongst these vows, hold law-

lawful and use, that of *perpetual Chastity*; which vow is generally taken by the cloistered Religious: and enjoyned also to all their Priests, who enter into Orders unmarried; though those, that are married before, are also admitted by them into such Orders: which vow, exacted from all such, argues, that they (agreeably with the *Western* Church, and contrary to the *Reformed*) hold all persons, using a meet endeavour, to be capable of this gift of *Continency*: and then, upon this granted, it can be no injustice in the Roman Church, in order to a greater freedom from secular cares, to exact that from the Clergy, that the Eastern doth from the Monks; and to enjoyn to so many of her Sons, as shall desire her spiritual preferments, that only, which, it is agreed, *all* are able to perform.

§. 165.

4ly. For *auricular*, or *Sacramental Confession* to the Priest (held necessary for all great, and mortal sins, by which Christians fall from the grace of their baptism); as also the injunction of meet penance for them: That these are taught, and practised in the Greek, as well as the Roman, Church, see *Jeremias* the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, *Resp.* 1. c. 11.—*Gabrielis Philadelph. Metropolit. lib. de Sacramento pœnitent.*—*Simeonis Archiepiscopi Thessalonic.* on the same subject *apud Morinum de Administrat. Sacrament. pœnitent.*—And *Goars Euchologion* in the *Orationes super pœnitentes* p. 678, 679. where also he sets down the *Officium confitentium*; and mentions the several sorts of penances usually prescribed: See also *Eugen. Roger. Recollect. Terre Sancte l.* 2. *tract.* 4. *c.* 5. Thus *Jeremias* the Patriarch †, to the Tubing Divines affirming, *Ut omnia peccata recenseantur, aut per singulas species enumerentur, non esse necessarium—Respondentes dicimus—Eum, qui confitetur, tum demum perfectam peccatorum suorum consequi curationem, si peccata omnia, omnesque eorum partes, quantum animus illi sufficit, & quantum meminisse potest, cum contrito, & humiliato corde recensuerit atque confessus fuerit; feceritque ea omnia, quæ maximè illis peccatis, quæ admisit, adversantur*; quoting S. *Basil* †—*Omne delictum apud eum, qui præsidet, referre oportet, malitia namque silentio tecta, occultus, ac sub cute latens, morbus est.* And, after, concerning Sacerdotal Absolution he saith †—*Neque quenquam absolvimus, nisi primò justas pœnas, & castigationes illi pro peccatis admissis injungamus; idque plurimas ob causas.* *Daille* † indeed quotes *Arcudius* || as saying, that the Greek, and Russian Bishops, and Priests seldom confessed, and that concerning this matter, Pope *Eugenius* also, in the Council of *Florence* †, questioned the Greeks—*Cur neque Pontifices neque Presbyteri celebraturi peccata sua confiteri soleant*: from which neglect of it, *Daille* gathers, they hold no necessity of it. But 1st. the

† *Respons.* 1. c. 11.
† *Ascetica.*
† c. 12.
† *De Confessione l.* 4. *c.* 1.
|| *De Sacramento l.* 4. *c.* 1
† *Sess. ult.*

neglect of a thing infers not the denial of it to be duty; and why may not *Daille* rather collect a neceſſity of auricular confeſſion to have been taught by the Clergy from the conſtant practice of it by the people, than a non-neceſſity held from the neglect of it in the practice of ſome of the Clergy? 2^ly. *Arcudius* himſelf (*Ibid.*) makes another comment upon it, ſaying, that this was not generally neglected by the Prieſts, but that *ſome* of them confeſſed more frequently; And again; for the deſuetude of confeſſion in others, gives this reaſon, not that they allowed what they did, but that many of them being guilty of crimes, for which by the Canons they were liable to be ſuſpended from their functions, choſe rather to conceal their faults, *& miſerè impœnitentes manere*, than to ſuffer ſuch cenſures, and publick ſhame; eſpecially whenas, confeſſion being held neceſſary only in caſe of mortal ſin, it cannot be required that any conſtantly, before he celebrate, or, within ſome ſhort ſpace of time, ſhould confeſs, becauſe it is not certain, that ſo ſoon he muſt fall into ſuch a *ſin* (without which ſome holy men are thought to have paſſed a great part of their life): and therefore, though an annual confeſſion is, by the Church, enjoyned to all, as being to them ſome way beneficial; yet is it not ſo enjoyned, as to all, for annual mortal ſin, *jure divino*, neceſſary. And, ſome ſuch way, it ſeems, the Pope in the Council of *Florence* received ſatisfaction from the anſwer of the Greeks, though, what it was, is not there ſet down. *Arcudius* † imagines ſome ſuch reply as this returned to him—*Nonnullos habere uſum confitendi; in pleriſque abuſum eſſe; neque enim* (ſaith he) *hac noſtrâ ætate Græci hoc benè fieri probare contendunt*, &c.

† *Ibid.*

§. 166. Concerning all the precedents, and ſeveral other points; that the full accord of the Greek, with the Roman, belief, and practice, may be yet more confirmed to you; be pleaſed to peruſe more particularly, the three anſwers of *Jeremias* Patriarch C. P. to the Lutheran Divines of *Tubing*; who ſent unto him their *Auguſtane* confeſſion, deſiring an agreement, and union between the Reformed, and the Greek Churches [*ut Conſtantini urbs Tubingaque Chriſtianæ concordiæ, & charitatis vinculo mutuo copulentur, quo nihil optatius contingere nobis poſſet* †] and that they might the eaſier obtain their requeſt, telling him that they ſubmitted to the firſt ſeven General Councils ‖ To whom firſt the Patriarch, going through all thoſe Articles, declareth the faith of the Greek Church, in the moſt, and moſt conſiderable, points, contrary to their, and conſenting with the Roman, Doctrines. And, they ſtill unſatisfied, and replying, writes a ſecond anſwer, in defence of his firſt; toward the end of which †, he thus paternally exhorts them—*Stemus itaque,*

† *Acta Theol. Wirtenberg. Epiſt.*—*See Jerem Patriarch. Epilog. fin.*

‖ *Epiſt. Theol. Tub. & Hier. Patriar. præfat. reſp. 1.*

† p. 250.

Fra-

Fratres, in petrâ fidei, & Traditione Ecclesiæ, non transferentes terminos à S. Patribus nostris positos: non dantes locum illis, qui rebus novis student, & ædificium sanctæ Dei, Catholicæ & Apostolicæ, Ecclesiæ dejicere cupiunt. Si enim talis licentia cuiquam concedatur: paulatim totum Ecclesiæ corpus destruetur. And, they not acquiescing, but a third time reassaulting him, and imposing (as he thought) a sence on the Scriptures contrary to the traditional, and also borrowing weapons out of the Greek Fathers (as they misapplied them) against him, he returns a third answer; in the conclusion of which he thus reprehends them in particular concerning these points—*Præterea* (saith he) *invocationem sanctorum vanam existimatis; & imagines eorum, venerandasque reliquias, & adorationem rejicitis. Rejicitis item mutuam alterius ad alterum* [1. *ad Sacerdotem.* See *Hieremi Respons. cap.* 11.] *confessionem; præterea monasticam vitam, angelis æqualem.* And then, disallowing their interpretation of Scriptures contrary to their meaning, now somewhat more provoked, he saith—*Chrysostomus & ipsius similes, divini viri spiritu sancto pleni* [divina dicta] *sic interpretati sunt, quemadmodum habemus, cæteræque Traditiones tales, cum approbassent ut necessarias, & pias, continuâ successione per manus veluti tradentes, ad nos usque propagarunt; quarum aliquas vetus etiam Roma observat, & nobiscum amplectitur.* [*Aliquas*, he saith, for several Points there are, in which the Greeks oppose the Roman Church, wherein the Protestants do side with the Roman against them; but amongst these *aliquas*, wherein both the Greek, and Roman Church agree against the Protestant, are all the forementioned points, and many more] *Unde igitur vos rectius, & melius veteri novæque Romæ sapuistis, ut veterum Theologorum scriptis relictis, vestra ista meliora potioraque duxeritis? Et schismata, quæ apud vos sunt, quæ multi variique Generis sunt, illa scilicet Lutheranorum, Hebræi aliqui, ut fama fert, pietatis simulatione introduxerunt, ac disseminaverunt; Et nunc etiam, sicut oculis cernitur, proficiunt in pejus, & quotidie crescunt. Cum quibus equidem nos prorsus non communicantes quicquam, Ecclesiæ nostræ mysteria immota servamus: manentes in iis, quæ dicta sunt à successoribus præconum Dei Apostolorum—Rogamus itaque vos, ne posthac labores nobis exhibeatis—Num Theologor, qui Ecclesiæ lumina fuerunt, aliàs aliter tractatis; & verba quidem honoratis eos, extollitisque; factis verò rejicitis; armaque nostra inutilia nobis efficere vultis, &c—Quamobrem quantum ad vos attinet, liberastis nos curis. Vestram ergo viam eunte, ne amplius de dogmatibus, sed amicitiæ tantùm causâ, si volueritis, scribite.*

§. 167. And much what the same tenents of the *Greek* Church, as are vindicated by *Hieremias*, you may find acknowledged by Sir *Edwin Sandys* in his relation of the *West*, *Relig.* p. 233. &c.—*With Rome*

saith he) *the Greek Church concurs in the opinion of* Transubstantiation; *and generally in the Sacrifice, and whole Body of the* Mass. And afterwards (p. 238.) he saith —— *For the form and ceremonies thereof they much resemble the Latins: Their Altar they encloſe from the people, that the Arcana of thoſe their ineffable croßings, and conventings, may not be proſtituted, and polluted by an unſanctified view; whereas the Romans lye fair, and open — They elevate the Hoſt forward, and near the Body of the Church; as the Latines do backward, and at the Altar.* And for their Liturgies † he confeſſeth — *That they are the ſame that in old time; namely S. Baſil's, and S. Chryſoſtom's, and S. Gregory's tranſlated; and theſe, without any bending of them to that change of language, which their tongue hath alſo ſuffered.* [Of which *Brerewood* in his inquiries c. 2. p. 12. gives this account — *That the difference is become ſo great between the preſent and the ancient Greek, that their Liturgy, yet read in the ancient Greek tongue, namely that of Baſil* [the longer] *on the Sabbaths, and ſolemn dayes, and that of Chryſoſtom* [the briefer] *on common dayes, is not underſtood (or but little of it) by the vulgar people: And the skilful in the learned Greek cannot underſtand the vulgar.* Thus he for the language: now, for the matter; If you pleaſe to peruſe this their modern Liturgy, and Church-Service, in *Goars* Εὐχολόγιον, or *Rituale Græcorum, juxta uſum Orientalis Eccleſiæ*, printed at *Paris* 1647. or in that printed before at *Venice* 16. . and to compare it with ancienter Copies of *S. Baſil's*, and *S. Chryſoſtom's, Miſſal*; and again compare both with the Roman; you ſhall find them either agreeing; or, where they differ one from another, the Greek as much offenſive to Proteſtants as the Latine Service, ſo that the Reformation muſt be confeſſed to be made againſt the publick Liturgie, both of the Eaſtern, and Weſtern (n.) of the whole Catholick Church. To go on] —— *They agree* (ſaith he) *in* praying *to* Saints; *in* auricular Confeſſion; *in offering of* Sacrifice, *and* Prayer *for the* dead; *in theſe without any (or no unmerrily) difference. They hold Purgatory not by any outward torment* [as he explains himſelf afterward] *but that the ſoul is not received into glory, till by an extream compunction and anguiſh of mind they have worn out thoſe ſtains, with which their ſins defiled them.* [As for the controverſie between them, and the Weſtern Doctors, whether ſuch ſuffering be by fire, it is a thing never determined one way or other in any Council], *And the worſhipping of pictures; kneeling to two, that of Chriſt and of our Lady; paſſing over the reſt with an ordinary reverence —— In ſum; they ſtill retain thoſe opinions, which grew in the Church before the ſeparation between the Greeks and the Latines;* [which ſeparation was firſt made about the year 800. but the Proteſtants condemn many Roman tenents, and practices,

† p. 235.

from

from 600. and then common to them with the Greeks]: *And all the Ceremonies, which were then common to both, they ſtill retain; as their croſsings, tapers, with certain others.* Thus he.

§. 168.

As for the differences (mentioned by *Sandys*) between the Greeks, and Latines, in other points; First, I appeal to the judgement of the ingenuous Reader, whether theſe points, wherein they are acknowledged to agree, be not the chief, and the main of thoſe, which are debated between the Reformed and Roman Church. Again; many of thoſe, wherein he mentions them to differ, are of ſmall moment; as their uſing *leaven* in their *Hoſts*, which the Latines avoid; their tolerating no *Images* in their Church [when as it is granted before, that they uſe *Pictures* in the ſame manner, as the Roman Church doth]: their uſing no round counters, or beads, for praying by tale: [theſe being brought up in the Weſt, after the diviſion of thoſe Churches]. Laſtly, as for other things that ſeem of more conſequence, wherein this Author makes theſe two Churches to diſſent, See them more fully collected by Dr. *Field* in his 3. *l.* 1. *c.* and ſpoken to below §. 181. n ſeveral of which, indeed, the Roman tenents are miſtaken, I mean, the tenents of their Councils, and of their more moderate Doctors. In which tenents, if the Greek Churches may be ſaid to agree with the Proteſtant, ſo alſo may theſe Doctors in the Roman. Concerning ſome of which I will ſet you down the late candid conceſſion of Mr. *Baxter* (no great friend of the Church of *Rome*, in his Key for Catholicks, *part.* 1. *c.* 5. —— *I am ſatisfied* (ſaith he) *that in many doctrinal points, the difference between us and the Papiſts, is not ſo great as commonly it is taken to be by many, if not by moſt, on both ſides: as in the points of certainty of ſalvation, of pardon, of juſtification, of works, of faith, and in almoſt all the Controverſies about Predeſtination, and Redemption, Free will, the work of Grace, &c. The Dominicans in ſenſe agree with the Calviniſts, (as they call them); and the Jeſuits with the Lutherans, and Arminians; and ſo in divers other points. How near doth Dr.* Holden *come to us in the fundamental points of the Reſolution of our faith? How near come the Scotiſts to us, in ſenſe about the point of merit? And* Waldenſis, *and others, yet nearer? How near comes* Contarenus *to us in the point of Juſtification? How near comes* Gerſon *in the point of venial, and mortal ſin? perhaps as near as we are to our ſelves. How near come the* Dominicans, *and* Janſenius *to us in the points of Predeſtination, Grace, and Freewill? For my own part, I ſcarce know a Proteſtant, that my thoughts in theſe do more concur with, than they do with* Janſenius. Thus *Baxter* concerning ſome of the Roman Doctors (yet who own the Council of *Trent*) agreeing with Proteſtants in thoſe points,

wherein *Sandys* and *Field* suppose the main difference to be between the Reformed, and the Roman Churches.

§. 169. †*View of Relig.* p. 476, 480.

To this of *Sandys* may be added the latter collection made by *Alexander Ross*† out of *Boterus, Chytraus, Brerewood, Possevine, Thomas a Jesu, Hieremias* Patriarch *Chapl. Resp. ad German. & Concil. Florent.* *The Greeks* (saith he) *place much of their devotion in the worship of the blessed Virgin* Mary; *and of painted, but not carved Images; in the intercession, prayers, help, and merits of the Saints; which they invocate in their temples. The Sacrifice of the* Mass *is used for the quick, and the dead; and they use to buy Masses* —— *They do not hold a Purgatory fire; yet they believe there is a third place, between that of the Blessed, and the damned, where they remain, who have deferred repentance till the end of their life. But if this place be not Purgatory, I know not what it is* [saith he]; *nor what the souls do there. Priests among them may marry once, but not ofter.* [But, p. 496. he saith, *that Protestants herein differ from the Greek Church; that the Protestants permit Priests after Ordination to marry: But the Greeks permit not this; but only, that a married man may be admitted into Holy Orders, so he abstain from his wife, when he officiates*]. *They use leavened bread in the Sacrament, and administer in both kinds.*

§. 170. [‘ But note, that what he saith of the *Moscovian*, (p. 485.) ‘ is also true of the Greek, Church; that they give to the people at ‘ once both the Body, and Blood of our Lord, mingled in the Cha- ‘ lice, with a spoon; and so to the sick only the Symbol of the bread, ‘ consecrated on *Maunday Thursday* for all the year following, and ‘ then, on that day, besprinkled with the other Symbol of the wine, ‘ and softned again for the sick with common wine when they admi- ‘ nister it, as hath been already said §. 163. (See *Goars* Εὐχολόγιον, ‘ p. 153.) which receiving both species together in a spoon, as it is ‘ testified by many Travellors, who have been spectators thereof, so ‘ it may be collected out of S. *Chrysostom's* Liturgy, as it is now ‘ used by the modern Greeks; where, before communicating the ‘ people, it is said—*Tunc accipiens Diaconus sanctum Discum, super* ‘ *sanctum calicem sanctâ spongiâ diligenter abstergit* [so putting the ‘ particle of the Symbol of the bread into the Chalice], *& adorans* ‘ *semel* [where also observe adoration] *sumit sanctum Calicem cum* ‘ *veneratione, & procedit ad ostium, & attollens sanctum Calicem osten-* ‘ *dit illum populo, dicens: cum timore Dei, & fide accedite:* and so ‘ with a little spoon called by the Greeks λαβὶς (which you may see ‘ described in *Goars* Εὐχολόγιον or *Rituale Græcorum*, p. 152.) takes ‘ out a very small particle thereof, and puts it into the mouth of ‘ the Communicant.]

§. 171. He goes on—*They have four Lents in the year: They will*

n ot

not have, neither the blessed souls in heaven, to enjoy Gods presence, or the wicked in hell to be tormented, till the day of Judgement. They esteem equal with the Scriptures the acts of the seven Greek Synods, and the writings of Basil, Chrysostom, Damascen, *and their Traditions. They believe, that the souls of the dead, are bettered by the prayers of the living. They are no less for the Churches authority, and for Traditions, than the Roman Catholicks be. When the Sacrament is carried through the Temple, the people, by bowing themselves, adore it, and falling on their knees, kiss the earth.*——*They have their Monks, who are all of S.* Basil's *Order: these have their Archimandrites, or Abbots. The Patriarch, Metropolitans, & Bishops are of this Order, and abstain from flesh; but, in Lent, and other fasting dayes, they forbear fish, milk, and eggs. The Greeks celebrate their Liturgies in the old Greek tongue, which they scarce understand. On the Festival dayes they use the Liturgy of* Basil; *on other dayes that of S.* Chrysostom. *They have no other translation of the Bible, than that of the* 70. Lastly, For *auricular* or *Sacramental Confession* to the *Priest*, though he omits it in the Greek, yet he † mentions it as used in the *Russian* Churches, which follows herein the practice of the Greek. Meanwhile, their chief differences from the Church of *Rome* he makes to be these: *Their denying the* Procession *of the* Holy Ghost *from the* Son; *their denying the* Pope's Supremacy; *their not using, either* Confirmation, *or* extreme Unction. But in the first of these, they differ not more from the Roman, than from the Protestant, Churches; In the second, not so much from the Roman, as do the Protestant Churches, (of which see below §. 181, 186.) As for the two last *Alexander Ross* might have found, in one of the chief Authors (*Jeremiah* the C. P. Patriarch †) both these Sacraments to be acknowledged by, and used in, the Greek, as well as Latine, Church-*Confirmation* being conferred by them alwayes immediately after *Baptism*—*Ad quod, illud dicimus* (saith he) *in eâ ipsâ orthodoxâ & Catholicâ Ecclesiâ septem divina Sacramenta esse,* [1] *Baptismum sci:* [2] *Sacri unguenti Unctionem* [or, as he stiles it afterward, *sacrum Chrysma, sive Confirmationem*] [3] *Sacram Communionem:* [4] *Ordinem:* [5] *Matrimonium:* [6] *Pœnitentiam: Et* [7] *Extremæ Unctionis oleum.* (Of which see below §. 181. *Resp. ad.* 9.)

† p. 485.

† *Resp.* 1. *c.* 7.

§. 172.

For these many differences of the Greek, as well as the Roman, from the Reformed Churches, it is, that *Mason*, being to prove a case of necessity for the ordaining of Protestant Ministers, beyond Seas, only by Presbyters, (in §. 23.) on that subject), argues thus,——*These Ministers could not receive Ordination from the Popish Churches, because of the abomination of their* sacrificing Priesthood; *and because these would ordain none, but in a Popish manner to a*

Popish

Popish Priesthood, &c. And neither (saith he) *by the same reason, could they obtain Ordination from the Greek Church. For* Bellarmine *denyeth it to be a Church, because they were lawfully convicted in three full Councils of Heresie; and especially of the Heresie about the proceeding of the holy Ghost; which, to be a manifest Heresie* (saith *Bellarmine*), *both the* Lutherans, *and the* Calvinists *do confess. Wherefore seeing no Church (as* Mason *goeth on) will give Orders but only to such persons as approve their doctrine, therefore they could not with a safe conscience seek to the Greek Church, whose doctrine they justly misliked. And being thus excluded from the Greek, and the Latine, from the East, and the West* [no Bishops being as yet turned Protestants to ordain] *what should be done? It was the duty of the Magistrates not to suffer false Prophets, and to plant godly Preachers in their places. But whence should they have them?---The Bishops were so far from yielding Ordination in any tolerable manner, that they persecuted such, as sought the Reformation. Wherefore it must either be devolved unto Presbyters, [i. e. such as had already deserted the former Church-Communion], or the Church of God must suffer most lamentable ruine, and desolation. And was not this a case of necessity?* Thus *Mason*, well seeing the Reformation as much destitute of any relief or countenance from the *Greek* Church, as from the *Roman*.

§. 173. And now, by the two Relations of *Sands*, and *Ross*, both *Protestants*, we may see, how much truth the assertion of *Cardinal Perron* (in his Reply to King *James*, Observation 3. c. 22.) hath in it, who there undertakes to make good: That these doctrines, or customs are common to the Western Church with the *Oriental*, and *Meridional* (upon which Doctrines, therefore, the *Pope's Supremacy* may be gathered to have had no influence): Namely, *Transubstantiation of bread into the Body of Christ*; *Adoration of the Eucharist*; *Oblation of the Sacrifice of the Mass, as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the living, and the dead*; *Prayer to Saints*; *Veneration of Reliques, and Images*: *prayer for the dead*; *Confession Sacramental, and Auricular*; *Lent*; *Vows*; *Celibacy of Religious*; *Interdiction of Priests to marry after having taken Orders*; *Seven Sacraments*; *using in Divine Service, the original Tongue, not understood by the vulgar. The same doctrine of Freewil, and Justification.*

§. 174. To *Perron* add *Grotius* his judgement in the Preface to his *Votum pro pace*; where, giving account of the success of his former Studies, he saith—*Ii, qui secesserant* [the reformed] *ut factum suum tuerentur, asserebant validè, doctrinam Ecclesiæ ejus, quæ cum sede principe cohæserat esse corruptam per multas hæreses, & idololatriam. Id mihi causas dedit inquirendi in dogmata ejus Ecclesiæ: legendi libros utrinque scriptos: legendi etiam, quæ scripta erant de* præsenti *statu, ac doctrina*

trinâ Ecclesiæ ejus quæ est in Graciâ, & earum, quæ per Asiam & Ægyptum ei cohaserunt. Inveni in Oriente, eadem esse dogmata, quæ essent in Occidenti, Conciliis Universalibus definita; de Regiminee Ecclesiæ (exceptis cum Papâ Controversiis), [i.e. about his authority] de Sacramentorum perpetuis Ritibus, sententias consonantes. Therefore the *Pope* easily indulged the Russian Greek Churches, who are subject to the King of *Poland*, when they reconciled themselves to the Roman Church, and submitted to his Supremacy, to continue all their former Grecian Rites, and Ceremonies; and the same he permitteth also to the Greek Church in *Rome*.

§. 175. This of the modern *Greek* Church, which now hath two *Patriarchs* undependent of one another; one residing at *Constantinople*, and another at *Hierusalem*, to which later the Greeks in, and about, *Palestine* do adhere. Now with the *Greek* Church are joyned in Religion, and Communion, * the *Russian* Churches (excepting those under the King of *Poland* joyned to the Roman); * the Inhabitants of *Georgia*, or *Iberia*; and * the *Melchites* of *Syria* (called so by other Sectaries, because they adhere to the Council of *Chalcedon*, *i. e.* as the other reported it, to the *Imperial* Faction. To whom also I may join the *Maronites*, conforming in their Liturgy, and most of the Ceremonies of their Religion to the *Greek* Church, but, in their Communion, now joyned to the *Roman*. Of these the *Maronites*, & *Georgians* have two independent Patriarchs of their own, set up without any conciliar authority acting therein; the one residing in a Monastery in Mount *Sinai*; the other in a Monastery in Mount *Libanus*. The *Metropolitan* of the *Russians* also hath, of late, cast off his subjection to the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, and stands absolute. Only the *Melchites* of *Syria* continue their subjection still to the *Patriarch* of *Antioch* translated to *Damascus*, *Antioch* now ruined.

§. 176. n. 1. Now if inquiry be made after the judgment or practice in the points forementioned of the other Churches, or Sects, in the Eastern parts of the world,

1. Here, 1st. If we should admit some variation or disparity of all these Churches from the rest as to several of these points, yet cannot these, reasonably, be put in the scale to counterballance the Greek and Latine Church, shewed already to be united therein. Especially, since these, I mean the remotest Eastern and Southern Churches, and chiefly those comprehended within the Patriarchate of *Alexandria* (with which also the *Ethiopian* or *Abyssin* Church hath alwayes run the same course, being a constant adherent to it) were the first part of Christianity, that was

over-born with the Power of *Mahomet* (that great falſe Prophet, and open oppoſer of our Lord Chriſt and his Kingdom); and ſo the firſt, wherein the Chriſtian Doctrine and diſcipline, learning and good manners, were oppreſſed, relaxed, and corrupted: theſe miſerable Churches falling under the Mahometan bondage in the ſeventh Century (ſuffering firſt the *Arabian* or *Sarazen*, and then the *Scythian*, or *Turkiſh*, tyranny), whereas the Greek meanwhile, was reſpited from it, till about the 14th. Againſt theſe Churches, alſo there want not ſome other prejudices: both, for that ſeveral of them have cauſleſly departed from the obedience of their former Patriarchs, and have ſet up new ones in their ſtead. And yet more, for that they have made a receſſion alſo from the former allowed General Councils; ſome of them, by maintaining Neſtorianiſm, and others Eutychianiſm contrary to them; and, as the Greek Church ſtands divided from the Roman in the *proceſſion* of the *holy Ghoſt*, ſo theſe again from the Greek, in the doctrine concerning the *unity* of the *perſon* & *plurality* of the natures of our *Lord*.

§. 176. n. 2. Of theſe Chriſtians, then, inhabiting the more Eaſtern Countries, *Armenia*, *Meſopotamia*, *Aſſyria*, *Perſia*, *India*, or the more Southern, *Egypt*, and *Ethiopia*; (thoſe called *Ægoſti* or *Cophti*, theſe *Abyſſines*); Of theſe (I ſay) the *Armenians* have ſet up two later Patriarchs of their own, the one for *Armenia* the greater, the other for the leſſer. The *Aſſyrians*, *Perſians*, and *Meſopotamians*, are ranged alſo under a new Patriarch, of *Muſal*, or *Babylon*; only the *Egyptians*, and *Abyſſines* are ſubject ſtill to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, now removed to *Grand-Caire*, and living in a Monaſtery at ſome diſtance from it. Again, of theſe thoſe Chriſtians that are diſperſed in *Aſſyria*, *Perſia*, and the more Eaſtern parts (except ſuch as are reduced by the *Roman Miſſions*) are generally ſaid to profeſs *Neſtorianiſm*, though this, as Dr. *Field* obſerves †, ſomewhat qualified; they not denying Chriſt the ſon of *Mary* from his firſt conception to be perſonally God, (as *Neſtorius* did) but affirming his humane nature ſo perfect alſo, as not to be ſeparated from its perſonality. On the other ſide, the *Armenians*, and *Jacobites* in *Meſepotamia*, and the *Egyptians* (or *Cophthites*), and *Ethiopians* (or *Abyſſines*) in *Affrick*, are held guilty of *Eutychianiſm*, or rather of *Dioſcoriſm* †; (who was Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and condemned in the Council of *Chalcedon*): they being ſaid to hold Chriſt to conſiſt *of* two natures indeed, and that they are not one by *commixtion*, contrary to *Eutyches*; but not to conſiſt *in* two natures, after the *union* of them; but theſe *two* natures, then, to become one by coadunation, according to *Dioſcorus*, who held theſe two natures ſo uni-

† *See Dr. Field of the Church*, p. 62—*Thom. a Jeſu de Converſion gentium. l. 7. c. 2. &c.*

† *Dr. Field*, p. 64, 66—*Thomas a Jeſu*, *l. 7. c. 14.*

ted

ted, that one personated nature arose out of two not personated, quoting for it some expressions of *Cyril* his predecessor. If this then be true, that Dr. *Field*, out of *Thom. a Jesu*, delivers of these *two* Eastern Sects, that stand distinct from the Greek Churches, though they be not perfect *Eutychians*, and *Nestorians* in their opinion, yet such they are, as do still transgress, and offend against the faith, and definitions of the third and fourth General Council; the later of which the greatest body of them expresly declares against. (See Dr. *Field* c. 1. p. 70, 71.) And, if so; there seems no reason, that they should be reckoned (as by some Protestants they are) not only *a part* (which some of them *Hereticis credentes*, or invincibly ignorant, may be internally, as to attaining salvation); but (if the Greek Church be added) the *main body*, of the *Catholick Church*; nor any reason, why her *Councils* should be esteemed defective, without their concurrence.

†*See Cassand. Liturg. c. 9. &c. concerning the Syrian, Armenian, Egyptian (or Abyssine) Liturgies.* *See Garetius his collections out of them. Centur. 16. p. 191.*

2. But, next, these considerations omitted, yet, as to the nine forementioned modern controversies of most note, *all* or the *most* of these *Eastern* bodies do seem, for as much as may be gathered, from their publick *Liturgies* and *Missals* (which they have either the same with those of the Greek Church, *viz.* S. *Chrysostom's* and S. *Basil's*, or very little varying from them †), and from the relations made by Travellors, they seem, I say, much what of the same profession with the *Greek* Church.

§. 177.

1^a. Concerning a *substantial* Conversion of the Symboles; or the *corporal* presence of our Lord's Body, and blood in the Eucharist, these all retain the same expressions in the Consecration with the Latine, and Greek, Churches; from which we may presume, that they understand them in the same sence; which *sence* when the Reformers varied from, they did think fit also, in their new Liturgies, to alter these *expressions*. The same corporal presence is confirmed, * from their offering in the same service this Body and blood as a *Sacrifice pro vivis, & defunctis* (a part of the *Mass*, which is also reformed in the new Protestant-Liturgies); and * from the like reverence performed by them, as by the Greek, and Latine Church in the handling, and receiving of these stupendious *Mysteries*; these Churches, for fear of the least indecencies, either receiving, after the manner of the Greeks, in a spoon the *Body* of our *Lord* intinct in the *Blood*; or else some little portion of the blood only in a spoon, if they receive the Body, and Blood apart; and some of these Nations, as the *Abyssines*, out of the great reverence to what they have received, are not permitted to spit the same day that they communicate; and, if such thing happen, it is scraped off the ground, and disposed of by the Priest; and, if a dog should

† *See Eugen. Roger Terre Saincte l. 2. p. 361.*

|| *Inquiries c. 15. &c.*

lick it up, he is presently killed †. Lastly, *Brerewood* ||, who hath collected out of several Histories and Relations, in what points these Eastern Churches are said to *differ* from the Roman, (for several Protestants do not so freely give account, wherein they consent), yet mentions nothing of their difference in the *corporal presence*, or *Transubstantiation*, save only of the *Armenians*, out of *Guido Carmel*: But S. *Thomas*, and *Richardus Armachanus*, who have formerly written against their errors, not questioning them for this, and their Mass in this matter not varying from the rest (See *Cassander's Liturgica* c. 12.) do argue their congruence with the rest in this opinion, and an error in *Guido*. This of the *corporal presence*.

For the other points following; [2] *Adoration.* [3] Offering the *Eucharist*, or the very Body and Blood of our Lord therein, as a *Sacrifice* for the living, and the dead, &c. [4] *Invocation* of the blessed *Virgin*, and the *Saints*. [5] *Praying* for the *Dead*, as beterable, by their intercessions, and oblations, in their present condition before the day of judgement; these also appear in the same Liturgies; and the second and third necessarily follow from the first †: And see *Thomas a Jesu* l. 7. c. 8. p. 370—383. as to the practice of the *Abyssine* Churches concerning the *two* last.

† *See before §. 160. n. 2.*

§. 178. To proceed to the other four points remaining. [1] *Using Communion in one kind*: [2] *A relative veneration of the Cross, and sacred Images, or Pictures.* [3] *Monastick Vows, and Celibacy of the Clergy*, and [4] *Auricular, or Sacramental Confession, and injunction of penances.* Concerning the first, it is granted: that a Communion in both kinds is ordinarily used, (though the *Abyssines* are said sometimes to receive only our Lords Body, and so do now the *Maronites* †): but, either after the manner of the Greek Church (§. 163.) not distinct *; used in *Egypt* in the fourth age: and then prohibited there by *Pope Julius* the First †; or, if distinct, a very small quantity of the blood, with very great caution, given in the bottom of a spoon. For the second, the Cross, and Pictures, and a due veneration of them, are used as well in these, as in the Greek, and Roman Church. See for the veneration of pictures in the *Abyssine* Church (according in most things with the *Egyptians*) *Thom. a Jesu* l. 7. p. 380. And the Priests and Religious are said to carry alwayes a Cross in their hands †. And for the use of crossing see the Liturgies.

† *Roger p. 361, 432.*

* *See Dr. Field. p. 63.*

† *De Consecrat. 2. c. 7.*

† *Roger's Terre Saincte p. 348.*

§. 179. n. 1. For the third, Monastick Vows, and Celibacy of the Clergy. The first of these cannot be denied to be practised in them all; and from this therefore the *lawfulness*, of the second, I mean, of an *injunction* of Celibacy to the Clergy, is justified, as hath been shewed

before

before §. 164; and a *necessity* of such Celibacy, *jure divino*, is not affirmed by the *Roman Church*. But for this second, The practice in these Churches is much what the same as in the Greek, *viz.* that persons married are freely admitted to be Priests; but none, after made Priests, suffered to marry: which being a yoke, that few, where liberty to take wives before-hand is granted, have a firm mind to undergo, hence it so happens, that most of the *secular* Clergy in these other Churches, as well as in the Greek, are *de facto* married; meanwhile † the *Regulars* that are *Priests* do live always in *Celibacy*, and so do all the *Bishops*; that are chosen out of Regulars, as they are (so chosen) most frequently; and in some Churches, as in the *Abyssine* †, and I think in the Greek, *they only* can be chosen *Bishops*.

† *Thom. a Jesu l. 7. c. 9.*

† *Terre Sainte* p. 347.

For the fourth, *Auricular*, or *Sacramental Confession*, and *penance*: though such confession in few, or none of these Churches (wherein the Church-discipline, in such a commixture of Mahometanism, and Heathenism, is much decayed) is so strictly observed as in the Roman, or yet as in the Greek Church, either as to their making it so often, as they receive the Communion; or, as to an enumeration of their particular faults, when they make it; yet it seems not to be altogether omitted, or disused, as with Protestants it is. *Zaga Zabo* an *Abyssine* Bishop saith † it is used by the *Abyssines*; and (to give it in *Brerewood's* words ‖ —*That presently, upon commission of sin, they resort to the Confessor; and at every Confession (though it were every day) receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist*—Again, that—*Mulieres gravidæ ante partus tempus semper confitentur, & corpus Domini confessæ accipiunt; ut infans, capiens inde nutrimentum, ex ejus communicatione sit sacratus*: And—*They have great respect* (saith the Fr. Recollect †) *to all the Sacraments; and as for Confession, they appoint rigorous penances; and those publick for publick offences.* And with these Authors may those, quoted by *Daille* † to say the contrary, well agree: whilst they speak of several parts of a vast Country, or of an *usual* omission of it by some of these Southern Christians before they receive, (for all receive frequently, *viz.* on all Festivals) †; and of a perfunctory performance of it, only *in general*, by many, when they do it. So *Thom. a Jesu*, out of the Bishop of *Sidon's* Relation † saith of the *Jacobites*, and *Armenians*—*Sacramentum confessionis rarissimè* [not, *nunquam*] *apud nationes illas frequentatur*: multique [not, *omnes*] *communicant sine auriculari confessione.* And of the *Cophthites* † *Moris non est ante vigesimum, aut circiter, annum unquam Sacramentum pœnitentiæ recipere* — And † —*Sacramentum Confessionis auricularis, ut est apud Ecclesiam* [Romanam], *Confirmationis, & extremæ Unctionis, ferè*

§. 179. n. 2.

† *Apud Damianum à Goes de Ethiopium moribus.*

‖ *Enquiries* p. 166.

† *Terre Sainte* p. 361.

† *De confessione auriculari l. 4. c. 1.*

† *Thom. a Jesu* p. 371.

† p. 387.

† p. 361.

† *Ib.* p. 416.

ferè *non agnoscunt*. Sacramental Confession therefore, in these Churches seems rather *de facto* much neglected, than *de jure* not allowed or required; and looks rather like a custom, by the malignity of time, somewhat defaced, than never at all known, or used. And this neglect of Confession, perhaps, may partly arise from a different judgment they have of *mortal* sin, (the only necessary matter of confession), whilst they account *some few* of the greatest, only such.

§. 180. Yet, for *external penances*, and austerities, especially in the *Monasticks*, and *Clergy* of these *Eastern*, and *Southern* Churches, they are observed to be very great: and one of the chiefest causes of their dislike, and contempt of the *Latine* Church (besides the difference, which they have in several other Ceremonies of Religion) to arise from hence, that they see many of them, in such corporal severities, more remiss: See *Rogers, Terre Saincte* l. 2. p. 335. – And *Thom. a Jesu* l. 6. p. 284. *Species austerioris vitæ, quæ in eorum Hieromonachis, Metropolitis, Archiepiscopis frequenter cernitur Latinos contemnendi præbet occasionem, &c.* So the *Abyssine* Religious, and Bishops † go barefoot, wear hair-cloth; never eat flesh; and in *Lent* (which they begin three dayes after the Purification), and other Fasts eat no Fish, or white-meats; make only one meal a day, without any Collation at Sun-set; drink no wine, though when they happen to be in a Country, that affords it; as their own doth not; use disciplines; carry great weights about their bodies. See much what the same abstinences of the Greek Bishops, and Monks †; who also keep four Lents, or solemn Fasts in the year, adding to ours, that of Advent: another, from the first of *August* to the Assumption of our Lady: another, from the Octave of Whitsuntide to S. *Peter*'s day; the same is said of the *Maronites* †, the same * or more of the *Armenian* Bishops, and Religious; never eating flesh, not indulging themselves in their Lents fish, white-meats, or so much as oyl, or any thing boiled. Hence are all these much displeased with the Western liberty of using fish, and wine, and Collations in Lent, and of several Religious Orders eating flesh out of it.

† *Roger Terre Saincte l.2. p.347.*

† *Ib.* p. 337. *Goar. Eucholog* p.407.

† *Ib.* p.426. * *Ib.* p.336.

From what hath been said (then) may be discovered the defects of that summary account, which, after a long discourse, Dr. *Field* (in l. 1. c. 1. p. 75.) gives of the Agreement both of the *Greek*, and other *Eastern* Churches with the *Protestants*, in all the principal modern Controversies, where he thus informs his Reader 1st. (saith he) *They all deny, and impugne that supreme universality of Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which the Bishop of* Rome *claimeth:* [Of this see below, §. 186. the Greeks allowing, though not so much as the Pope claimeth; yet more than, I think, many

§. 181.

many Protestants will consent to]. 2ly. (saith he) *They think him subject to error as all other Bishops are.* [So do Roman Catholicks too.] 3ly. *They deny, that he hath any power to dispose the Principalities and Kingdoms of the world, or depose Kings.* [The Pope's having lawful power to depose Kings, is no article of faith in the Roman-Catholick Church]. 4ly. *They acknowledge all our righteousness to be imperfect; and that it is not safe to trust thereunto, but to the meer mercy, and goodness of God.* [And the Roman Catholick doctrine is; *That in many things we offend all:* that, though some may be, yet most of the good works of the regenerate are not, free from mixture of venial sin, or some imperfection; that none certain, (except by extraordinary Divine Revelation), of his *Justification* (or, as the Protestants had rather call it, *Sanctification*); and for this the Cardinal's *Tutissimum est, &c.* is very famous: But do no Protestants presume further?] 5ly. *They admit not the merit of congruence, condignity, nor works of supererogation.* And 6ly. *They teach not the doctrine of satisfactions, as the Romanists do.* [The Doctrine of the Roman Church (rightly understood), concerning these points, is neither contradicted by the Eastern Churches, nor by some sober Protestants; but indeed much misrelated by Dr. *Field* l. 3. p. 58] 7ly. *They believe not Purgatory, neither pray to deliver men out of temporal punishments* [I suppose he means, or *sufferings*] *after this life.* [It is true, they believe no purgatory-fire; but, that they hold some temporal sufferings, from which they are freeable by prayer made for them, See before §. 192. and Sir *Edw. Sandy*'s testimony §. 167. And enough confessed in this matter even by Dr. *Field* l. 3. p. 59. if I rightly understand him.] 8ly. *They reject the doctrine of the Romanists touching indulgences, and pardons.* [The same is returned to this, as to the fifth and sixth]. 9ly. *They believe not, that there are seven Sacraments.* [This is questioned only for *Confirmation*, & *Extreme Unction*; and see these maintained by Jeremias the Patriarch, and many other Authors, as to the Greek Church†. In other Eastern Churches Chrysm, or holy Oyl is so used, at least for Baptism, as it is in the Greek Church; and in some Churches also to sick, or dying persons] ||. 10ly. *They omit many Ceremonies in Baptism, which the* Roman *Church useth, as spittle, &c.* [Nor doth the *Roman* Church hold it necessary, that they should use the same.] 11ly. *They have no private Masses.* [It is accidental in the Roman Church, that any *Masses* are *private*; i. e. that the Priest communicates alone; and happens only, because others are not prepared to receive with the Priest, not because they are prohibited; and if any faulty herein,

† *Resp. l. c. 7.* *See* Goars *Eucholog. concerning confirmation* p. 366. — *Concerning Extreme Unction, their Officium Sancti Olei*, p. 408, 432.

|| *Thom. a Jesu.* p. 361, 398, & 387.

it

it is the people, or other Clergy, that attend the Mass without communicating, not the Priest in offering the daily Christian Sacrifice, and himself at least participating thereof; the Greeks never communicating alone, celebrate seldomer, *viz.* only on Festivals; on those dayes only one of them, all the rest attending him: and this, in the same Church, but once; so that their more compleatness in one thing is accompanied with some deficiency in another. Lastly, the Church of *Rome* wisheth, that no *Masses* at all were *private* (i.e. where the Priest officiating finds no fellow-Communicants) but is loth to purchase this at such a loss, as some others do, *viz.* the omission of her frequent, and dayly, or also hourly, intercessions with God for all necessities, by this most acceptable sacrifice offered to him by the fervent devotion of so many of her Priests. 12ly. *They minister the Communion in both kinds to all Communicants.* [Of this see what is said before §. 163. The Church of *Rome* holds it not *necessary* but only *lawful*, and expedient (as the times are) to do otherwise; and also indulgeth receiving in both kinds to several of her Communion.] 13. *They believe not Transubstantiation, nor the new real sacrificing of Christ.* [In the Eucharist is affirmed by the Roman Church only a Sacrifice *commemorative* of that of the *Cross*; and this effective only in the *virtue* and *merit* of that. Of the Eastern Church's Tenent concerning Christ's corporal presence in the Eucharist, and consequently of their use of this Sacrifice agreeing with the Roman Church, and contrary to the Reformed, See before §. 158. n. 2. & §. 160. 14. *They have the Divine Service in the vulgar tongue.* [Some Eastern Churches have so, the most have not. The Divine Service is celebrated in the corrupt *Chaldee*, or *Syriack*, amongst the *Maronites*, *Cophthites*, *Nestorians*, *Assyrians* or *Jacobites*, *Indians*; and in the *Greek*, among the *Melchites*, and *Georgians*, the vulgar to all these being *Arabick*, or to some, more Easterly, the *Persian* tongue; and in the ancient and pure Greek still, among the *Grecians*, (as it is in the Latine among the *Latines*), where those, who speak the vulgar Greek do understand little of it. (See *Brerewood's* Enquiries p. 9. 12. 61. 192. 196.) only; in the East, the *Armenians*; in the North, the *Moscovites* and some other *Sclavonians*; in the South, the *Abyssines*, people most ignorant of the learned languages, have it in their vulgar; and in this have only what the Church of *Rome* maintaineth lawful, and easily indulgeth to several Nations of its Communion, as it did long ago to the *Sclavonians*, by Pope *John* 8. and now of late to the *Chineses* by Pope *Paul* 5. at the request of the Jesuites]. 15. *Their Priests are married; and though they permit them not to marry a second wife without special dispensation,*

on,

en. yet if any do, they do not void nor dissolve the marriage. [To this see what is said before §. 164. with them men married may receive Orders, after Orders received none may marry] 16. *They make no image of God.* [Nor any among the Latines, with the same intention, as other images; *viz.* thereby to resemble the figure, or nature of God; such an *image verum Idolum constitueret* (saith *Bellarmine*) †. Only this is by many held lawful, an holy History in a Table, and that to represent to some mens eyes, what hath been seen by other men's; as the sitting of the antient of days in *Daniel* c. 7. or the descent of the holy Ghost in *Mat.* c. 3. That is, not to shew what these persons are, but how they have appeared, where is no danger of mistake by it what they are; as also incorporeal *Angels* are innocently represented winged boyes]. † *De Imag. l. 2. c. 8.*

17. *They have no Massy images, but pictures only.* [But they give the same relative veneration to sacred *pictures* (which Protestants omit to mention) as the *Latines* to their *images*; though some Latines also do forbear the use of embossed images.

18. *They think, that, properly, God only is to be invocated; and howsoever they have a kind of invocation of Saints, yet they think that God only heareth them, and not the Saints.* [God only is *properly* invocated, as the only fountain, and doner of all we petition for, say also Roman Catholicks; and the Saints only are sued to, as *Comprecators*; that what follows, is misrelated, see before §. 161.] This is opposed to Dr. *Fields* account, how rightly, is left to your judgment. Meanwhile as in these points Dr. *Field* hath noted the Eastern and Western Churches to differ; so we may conclude, that, in those other points of modern controversie that are omitted by him; (as *Freewill, Justification not by faith alone; adoration of the Eucharist; and offering it* pro vivis, & defunctis; *Monastick life, and vows; Sacramental Confession, and penances; their publick service*, and the Ceremonies attending it, they do agree; or that this Doctor was somewhat overseen in his choice.

To this *consent* of the modern *Greek* Church with the *Roman*, in many of the modern Controversies much urged by Roman Catholicks (especially from *Jeremias* Patriarch of *Constantinople* his censure) to prove the Protestant's departure not from the Roman only, but the whole modern Catholick Church, you may see, if you please, what answers have been returned by several other late Protestant Writers; by Arch-Bp. *Laud* § 29 n. 4. by Bp *Bramhal* Reply to *Chalced.* c. 9. p. 356. by Dr. *Gunning* in a conference with some of the Roman party called *Schism unmasked* p. 605. by Mr. *Stillingfleet Rational account* part. 2. c. 8. p. 500. &c. And by the *Witten-*

berg Divines against *Socolovius* in the preface before their Acts with the same Patriarch.

To give you some account of them; and here to begin with these last, who first apologiz'd. These *Tubing* Divines in their Reply to *Socolovius*, whilst they produced nothing, wherein the Patriarchs doctrines suited with theirs, save *Communion* in *both* kinds, and the admitting *married* men to take *Orders*, thought fit rather to justifie the lawfulness of a reformation, though against the whole Catholick Church of that time, on this manner — *Defectionem porrò à Romanâ pontificiâ Ecclesiâ, immò, ut Rhetor amplificat, ab ipso terrarum orbe, omnibusque Ecclesiis, quòd nobis objicit, sciat Polonus iste, & discat, si ignorat, non omnem defectionem vitio vertendam esse hominibus. Quoties enim Deus populum suum per Prophetas suos hortatus est, ut averterent se à viis suis pessimis, quas à suis majoribus pessimis didicerant? Johannes in suâ Apocalypsi hortatur Ecclesiam, ut exeat à Babylone (quam Hieronymus Romam intelligendam docet), ne plagarum ejus fiat particeps* — And there also they declare the intention of their sending their confession into the East (notwithstanding what is said before §. 166.) — *Si quo modo* (say they) *per gratiam Dei, & operationem Spiritus sancti, oculi cæcutientium; hoc modo, & medio aperiantur, & erroribus usitatis aliquot sæculorum agnitis, eisdem valedicentes, ad veritatis agnitionem pervenirent* — And afterwards — *Se Græcos non constituisse communis causæ judices, neque studiosè ab illis recipi petiisse; sed hoc egisse studiosè, quod bonos, cordatos, & pios decet viros, ut ad agnitionem synceræ doctrinæ Religionis eos perducerent.* And they apologize for their not publishing the Patriarchs answer — *Quòd nullam admodum ex istâ editione ad Ecclesiam Christi utilitatem perventuram sperare possent; cùm alia existent plurima ac meliora scripta, & malorum alias plus satis sit.* Lastly, make their appeal, notwithstanding, to the Catholick Church; but this collective of *all* ages, and including the *Apostles* — *De nostro cum Apostolicis Ecclesiis dissidio mentitur. Nos certe non solùm ad has, sed etiam omnium temporum universalem, Patriarcharum, Prophetarum, & Apostolorum Ecclesiam provocare non dubitamus: cum quibus nos conjunctissimos esse luculenter supra, ex ipsâ Scripturâ Propheticâ, & Apostolicâ est demonstratum.* Such was the reply of these German Divines.

§. 183. To come to our own men. Mr. *Stillingfleet* (a) 1st. endeavours to weaken the *Patriarch's* authority by saying) † — *That it is well enough known, how much Barbarism had crept into the Greek Church after their being subdued by the* Turks, *the means of instruction being taken from them; and that it is therefore more to be wondred, they should preserve so much of the doctrine of faith entire as they have done, than that*

(a) † Rat. account p. 503.

any

any corrupt practises should prevail amongst them. 2. Next, (β) *That, as in some things he is opposite to the* Protestants, *so in other things to the Church of* Rome †: *that it is sufficiently known, how much the Greeks agree with the Protestants* (γ) *in the opposition to the great points, of the* Pope's Supremacy; (δ) *and the* infallibility *of the Church of* Rome; (ε) *how far they are from the belief of* Purgatory *in the Roman sence. That the Patriarch doth also profess his consent with Protestants*; †(ζ) *that the Sacrament was to be received in both kinds*; (η) *that the use of Marriage was not absolutely to be forbidden the Clergy. And* (θ) *that he opposed also invocation of Saints in such a sence, as that they hear us.* Thus he; and some of these are mentioned also in the forecited conference with Dr. *Gunning*.

β. † p. 500. γ. δ. ε. † p. 502. ζ. η. θ.

§. 184. To α.

To what he saith first, (α) I answer; that, as Protestants urge this present illiterate, and desolate condition of the Eastern Churches, when their opinions or practice make against them; so it is meet they should remember it, when, in their appealing to a General Council, they seem to set so high a value on the judgment, and sentence of *these remote* Churches therein; resting no way satisfied with that of the *West*. Next; I say, whatever corrupt practices have prevailed of late times in the *East*, yet that as for those, wherein both *East*, and *West* (that is, the whole Catholick visible Church) at *Luther's* coming agreed in (especially, when at such enmity between themselves), these Churches, in both of them having the like customs, do bear mutual witness to one another, that they could be no *innovations* in either of them.

§. 185. To β.

To (β.) *viz.* the *Greek* Churches their agreeing in some things with *Protestants* against the Church of *Rome*, as in others with the *Roman* Church against *Protestants*; from which it seems to follow, that the Church of *Rome*, must as well be culpable of Schism, or any other crime, in what the Greeks, and Protestants differ from it; as the Protestants, in what the Greek, and the Roman accord in, against it: I answer, that any Churches co-ordinate may, without Schism, or fault, differ from one another, or one of them from all the rest, in several doctrines, and opinions; if such opinions or doctrines, be not defined, or the practice of them not required by any their Superiors; but, any Church differing from the rest in any doctrine formerly defined, or to which conformity is required by their Superiors, or by the whole, I mean either by a General, or any other Superior Council, wherewith also the belief, or practice of the *whole* consenteth; such Church cannot be freed from Schism. Now that several of those points, wherein the Protestants have left the *Greek*, and *Roman*, when agreeing in them, are such, See Disc. 1. §. 50. n. 2. But not such those, wherein the Roman, and Western

Churches adhering to it, do differ from the *East* and *Protestants*.

§. 186. To (γ.) The first of those instances, wherein he urgeth the consent of the Eastern Churches with Protestants, *viz.* their opposing the *Pope's Supremacy*, I answer, that, though there are several branches of the Pope's Supremacy, which the modern *Greeks* allow not, (but, so, there are also some, that the *French* Church doth not admit); yet it is well known, that thus much the Representatives of the Greek Church, in the Council of *Florence*, subscribed; That the Bishop of *Rome* was Successor *Petri Principis Apostolorum, totiusque Ecclesiæ Caput; & cui, in Beato Petro, gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam plena potestas tradita est*; and the Greek Church never denyed his *Primacy*, and *Presidency in General* Councils, as appears,* by the fifth Canon of the second General Council at *Constantinople* consisting only of Eastern Bishops — *Constantinopolitanæ Civitatis Episcopum habere oportet Primatus honorem post Episcopum Romanum*: * By the Eastern Bishops in the fourth General Council (the most numerous of any that hath been) allowing the Presidency to the Roman Bishops Legats (witness Arch-Bp. *Lawd* †): * By *Cyril* an Eastern Bishop his presiding in the third General Council, *Ut Celestini, Episcopatum antiquæ Romæ gerentis, locum obtinens*; (witness *Evagrius*) †, whose Deputy, or Legate also he was made for the Excommunication of *Nestorius* by the authority of the Apostolick See; witness, the Pope's Letter to *Cyril* † — [*Nostrâ vice, & loco cum potestate usus ejusmodi sententiam exequeris, &c.*] and Mr. *Stillingfleet* † * by the Roman Legates also subscribing the first general Council of *Nice* before all the Patriarches; and I know not why it is, that Protestants, granting this Bishop the *Primacy* among the Patriarchs; (and, *why should he, being the Bishop of the chief See*, saith Mr. *Stillingfleet* †, *in case of general concernment of the Church, as that of* Chalcedon [I add, and of other General Councils] *not be allowed by his Legates to have the prime place?*) yet should take so much pains † to shew *de facto*, that in some Councils, He, or his Legats, had it not, or did dot preside therein.

p. 214.

† *Evagrius l. c. 4.*

† *Act. Conc. Ephes. tom. 1.* p. 487.

† p. 488.

† *See Stillingf. from* p. 482. *to* 489

To the second: (§.) I answer, had Mr. *Stillingfleet* not thrust in the term *Roman* (the infallibility of which, taken singly, is no Article of Faith in the Western Church †); that, as for the infallibility of the Church Catholick; or of her lawful General Councils in their definitions concerning matter of Faith; I suppose he knew the Greek Church to ascribe therein no less to It, or Them, than the Roman doth. Of which thus *Jeremy* the *Constantinopolitan* Patriarch in his first answer to the *Lutheran* Divines — *Quod* [i.e. ut legi divinæ adversentur] *de his, quæ à nobis dicta sunt, nullo modo vere intelligi*

§. 187.

To §.

† *See Bellarm. de Concil. l. 2. c. 4.*

telligi potest.—Ea enim, quæ Synodicè constituta sunt omnes Christi fideles tanquam divinitùs inspirata Scripturæ consentanea recipiunt atque amplectuntur semper. To which Synodical decrees therefore this Patriarch requires a most strict submission of judgment, and constitutes them the ultimate establishers of the Christian Faith in all matters controverted, seriously advising the Lutherans to a final acquiescence therein—*Neque enim nobis licet* (saith he †) *privatâ confisis interpretatione, aliquid divinitùs inspirata Scripturæ aut ipsos intelligere, aut aliis tradere, nisi quantum cum scopo sanctorum Synodorum, Ecclesiæque sancta Theologorum, illud ipsum convenit.* [why so?] *—Ne semel ex recto Evangelicæ doctrinæ tramite abrepti, præcipites feramur; neve sensus deinceps noster more Protei, in hanc & illam formam fidei transferatur.* Again—*At forte dicet quis vestrum* [of the Lutherans], *quæ igitur earum rerum, quæ suo loco dimotæ sunt, correctionis spes? Quæ ratio? Hæc, inquam, si nihil præter ea, quæ nobis à sanctis Apostolis* [including the *Canones Apostolici*] *sanctisq; Synodis divinitùs ordinata sunt ordiemur, nihil aliud sequemur.* And—*Una & sola rerum recuperandarum ratio supereſt, idem semper cum sanctis Conciliis sentire, Canonibusq; Apostolicis per omnia inhærere, & sic in omnibus Christum Dominum, & Magistrum sequi.* Thus you see East and West (excepting the Protestants) do agree in the same language concerning the infallibility of, and duty of adherence to, the Church and her Councils for matters of Faith. And even those *Eastern* Sects, who refuse submission to the third or fourth General Council, do it not on this account, that lawful and free General Councils may err; but, that these, over-powered by the Emperor, were not *free*; thence calling their followers, *Melchites*.

† *Responſ.* 1. *Epilog.*

To the third: (ε.) I answer, That their difference is only about Purgatory-fire, a thing never defined in the Roman Church. But for the agreement, and practice of both Churches in prayer for the dead with the same intentions, See before §. 162. To ε.

To the fourth: (ζ.) See what is said before §. 163. To ζ.

For the fifth: (η.) I refer you to §. 164. To η.

And for the sixth: (θ.) to §. 161. leaving to the equal Readers judgment, whether, in any of those here named, there be any considerable difference, save in the first. This, in answer to Mr. *Stillingfleet*. To θ.

§. 188. The Arch-Bp. saith—*As for* Jeremias; *'tis true, his censure is in many things against the* Protestants, *but I find not, that that censure of his is warranted by any authority of the* Greek *Church.* To satisfie this, see their modern Liturgies, and Rituals, and the other authorities, that are quoted before for several points, (§. 158. n. 2 &c. 165.) concurring with what *Jeremias* hath delivered.

§. 189. Bishop *Bramhal* opposeth to this testimony of *Jeremias* the contrary testimony of *Cyril* a late Patriarch there in the Confession of his Faith; which had not the new set up press at *Constantinople* been disturbed, he intended to have printed there, and to have dedicated to the King of *England* (See *Knowles Tur. Hist.* A.D. 1628. *&c.*) having sent also some, who had relation to him, to be educated in Divinity in one of our Universities. To which I answer. 1st. That, to shew, that the Protestants Reformation was not made from the whole Church Catholick, but only the *Roman*, we are to prove, not what the Grecian opinions are since, but what they were, when first the Reformation was made. Now *Jeremias* his declaration was not long after the beginning of the Reformation, and *Cyril*'s above 50. years, after his. 2ly. Concerning the newness of *Cyril*'s opinions, the words of *Knowles* (*ibid.*) are considerable, who there saith —— *That he was a reverent, and learned man, and that he desired to reform many errors, and to enlighten much of the blindness of his Church.* So that it seems he was a Reformer in the Greek Church, as these others were in the Western; which also appears from the complaints, and persecution against him, more than against his Predecessors, by the Agents of the Roman Church, upon this pretence (*Knowles, ibid.*) And he is said † at last, for certain crimes objected to him, and among others charged with innovations in Religion by the Greeks, to have been imprisoned, and shortly after executed, and another *Cyril ab Iberia*, formerly rejected, to have been repossessed of his Chair. But 3ly. How contrary soever *Cyril*'s opinions are to those of *Jeremias*; yet the same testimonies above-named †, that shew *Jeremias*'s to be the doctrines of the Greek Church, shew *Cyril*'s (whoever had new reformed him) not to be so. But 4ly. Indeed his declaration, though it seems purposely moulded according to the Calvinists expressions, is very short, and sparing; general, and unclear; extending to few points, and waving the rest, and forbearing there to mention any one point (save that of the procession of the holy Ghost) wherein the Greeks differ from the reformed (as, surely, in some they do); and again, those points therein, in which *Cyril* seems more clearly to contradict, both *Jeremias*'s, and the Roman tenents: namely, the denying of *Purgatory*, and of *Transubstantiation*; (if therein he intend to deny all sorts of Purgatory, though not by fire; and all transmutation of the Elements in the Eucharist); are unquestionably singular, and not owned by the Greeks, as is shewed before, and as is witnessed also by some reformed †, out of the common relations of the Grecian opinions, and practices. 5ly. If *Cyril*, or any other Patriarch of *Constantinople* should

† *Spondan. A. D.* 1638. *Franc. à S. Clarâ system fidei*, p. 528.

† §. 158. n 2. — 165-162.

† §. 167, 169. &c.

should entertain any reformed and new opinions diverse from his predecessors, whilst such a one is not followed in them by the rest of the Church: These are to be stiled, not its doctrines, but his own; and it is not denied that Patriarchs as well as others, may be heretical, for in several ages some have been so. But 6ly. If the rest of the Greek Church should also have concurred with *Cyril* in such *innovation*, then will this only follow, that it is true of the *Greek* Church, as of the *Protestant*, that they also have reformed from the whole Catholick Church, (1.) from the *former*, as well *Greek* Church, as *Latine*; and so, this fact of theirs will prove no just plea for the Protestant practice, (if a departure from the Church Catholick be *Schism*), but only the enlargment of the same guilt to another Church.

THE

should entertain any reformed and new opinions diverle from his predeceflors; whilft fuch a one is not followed in them by the reft of the Church: Theſe are to be ſtiled, not de-ſtrines of one his own; and it is not denied that Patriarchs as well as others, may be heretical, for in ſeveral ages ſome have been ſo. But 6^ly. If the reſt of the Greek Church ſhould al-ſo have concurred with Cyril in ſuch innovation, then will this only follow, that it is true of the Greek Church, as of the Proteſtant, that they alſo have reformed from the whole Catholick Church, (i.) from the former, as well Greek Church, as Latine; and ſo, this fact of theirs will prove no juſt plea for the Proteſtant practice, (if a departure from the Church Catholick be ſuch(w)), but only the ſeparation of the ſame guilt to another Church.

THE

THE FOURTH DISCOURSE

Containing the SOCINIANS Apology for the believing, and teaching, his Doctrine, againſt former Church-Definitions, and preſent Church-Authority, upon the Proteſtant's Grounds.

Divided into Five CONFERENCES.

The I. CONFERENCE.

The *Socinian's* Proteſtant-Plea for his not holding any thing contrary to the *Holy Scriptures*, §. 2.

1°. *THat he believes all contained in the Scriptures to be God's Word; and therefore implicitely believes thoſe truths, againſt which he errs.* Ib.

2. *That, alſo, he uſeth his beſt indeavours to find the true ſence of Scriptures: and, that more is not required of him from God for his faith or ſalvation, than doing his beſt endeavours for attaining it.* §. 3.

3. *That as for an explicite faith required of ſome points neceſſary; he is ſufficiently aſſured, that this point concerning the Sons conſubſtantiality with the Father, as to the affirmative, is not ſo, from the Proteſtant's affirming all neceſſaries to be clear in Scripture, even to the unlearned; which this, in the affirmative, is not to him.* §. 4.

4. *That ſeveral expreſs, and plain Scriptures do perſwade him, that the negative (if either) is neceſſary to be believed; and that from the clearneſs of Scriptures, he hath as much certainty in this point, as Proteſtants can have; from them, in ſome other, held againſt the common expreſſions of the former times of the Church.* §. 6, 8.

5. *That, for the right underſtanding of Scriptures, either he may be cer-*

certain of a juſt induſtry uſed; or elſe, that Proteſtants, in aſſerting that the Scriptures are plain only to the induſtrious; and then, that none are certain, when they have uſed a juſt induſtry, thus muſt ſtill remain alſo uncertain in their faith; as not knowing, whether ſome defect in this their induſtry cauſeth them not to miſtake the Scriptures.

6. *Laſtly; That none have uſed more diligence in the ſearch of Scripture, than the* Socinians, *as appears by their writings, addicting themſelves wholly to this Word of God, and not ſuffering themſelves to be any way byaſs'd by any other humane, either modern, or ancient, authority.* §. 5.

Digreſs. { Where *the* Proteſtant's, *and* Socinian's *pretended certainty of the ſence of Scripture apprehended by them, and (made the ground of their faith) againſt the ſence of the ſame Scripture declared by the major part of the Church, is examined.* §. 9.

The II. Conference.

His Plea, for his not holding any thing contrary to the unanimous *ſence of the Catholick Church*, ſo far as this can juſtly oblige. §. 13.

1ª. *That an unanimous conſent of the* whole *Catholick Church in all ages, ſuch as the Proteſtants require for the proving of a point of faith to be neceſſary, can never be ſhewed, concerning this point of* Conſubſtantiality. §. 13.

And that the conſent, to ſuch a doctrine, of the major part *is no argument ſufficient, ſince the Proteſtants deny the like conſent valid for ſeveral other points.* §. 14.

2. *That, ſuppoſing an unanimous conſent of the Church Catholick of all ages in this point, yet from hence a Chriſtian hath no ſecurity of the truth thereof according to Proteſtant Principles, if this point, (whether way ſoever held) be a non-neceſſary; for that in ſuch, it is ſaid, the* whole *Church may err.* §. 15.

3. *That this Article's being, in the affirmative, put in the Creed proves it not (as to the affirmative) a neceſſary.* §. 16.

1ª. *Becauſe not originally in the Creed, but added by a Council; to which Creed if one Council may add, ſo may another of equal authority in any age, and whatever reſtrain the made by a former Council.*

2. *Becauſe ſeveral Articles of the later Creeds are affirmed by Proteſtants not neceſſary to be believed, but upon a previous conviction, that they are divine revelation.* §. 16.

4. *Laſtly,*

4. *Lastly. That, though the whole Church delivers, for truth, in any point, the contrary to that he holds; he is not obliged to resign his judgment to hers, except conditionally, and with this reservation, unless, on the other side, there appear evidence to him in God's Word. Now, of the evidence of Scripture in this point on his side, that he hath no doubt.* §. 17.

The III. Conference.

His Plea, for his not holding any thing contrary to the definitions of *lawful General Councils*, the just conditions thereof observed. §. 18.

That *he conceives he ows no obedience to the Council of* Nice.

1. *Because this cannot be proved to have been a lawful General Council with so much certainty, as is necessary for the ground of his faith, as appears by those many questions mentioned by* Mr. Chillingworth, Stillingfleet, *and other Protestants, wherein he must first be satisfied, concerning it: which see Disc.* 3. § 86. *&c* – §. 18.
2. *Because, though it were a General Council, yet it might err even in necessaries, if it were not universally accepted; as he can shew, it was not.*
3. *That, though yielded to be generally accepted, it might err still in non-necessaries; and that Protestants cannot prove this point to be otherwise.*
4. *That the leaders of this Council were plainly a party, contesting his, for many years before, with the other side, condemned; and were Judges in their own cause.*
5. *All these exceptions cancelled, and obedience granted due to this Council; yet, that so, there is due to it not that of* assent, *but only of* silence. §. 19.
6. *But yet not that of silence neither from him; considering his present persuasion, that indeed the affirmative in this point is an error* manifest, *and* intolerable: *concerning which matter his party having long complained to their Superiors, and produced sufficient evidence; yet these have proceeded to no redress of it.* §. 20.
7. *But yet, that he will submit to the judgement of a future Council, if it, rightly considering the reasons of his tenent, decree that, which is according to God's Word, and he be convinced thereof,* §. 22.

The IV. Conference.

His Plea, for his not being guilty of *Hereſie*. §. 23.

THat he cannot rightly, according to Proteſtant Principles, be accuſed as guilty of Hereſie, for ſeveral reaſons.

1. Becauſe, Proteſtants holding Hereſie to be an obſtinate defence of ſome error againſt a fundamental, he thinks, from hence his tenent freed from being an Hereſie, as long as in ſilence he retains it, unleſs he engage further, to a publick pertinacious maintaining thereof. §. 23.
2. Fundamentals varying according to particular perſons, and ſufficient propoſal; none can conclude this point, in the affirmative, to be, as to him, a fundamental, or, of the truth which he hath had a ſufficient propoſal.
3. That a lawful General Council's declaring ſome point Hereſie, doth not neceſſarily argue, that it is ſo; becauſe they may err in Fundamentals; or at leaſt in diſtinguiſhing them from other points. §. 26.
4. That he can have no autocatacriſie, or obſtinacy, in a diſſenting from their Definitions, till he is either actually convinced, or at leaſt hath had a ſufficient propoſal either of the truth of ſuch point defined: Or that ſuch Councils have authority to require ſubmiſſion, of judgement, and aſſent, to their Definitions: of which conviction, or ſufficient propoſal (that varies much, according to the differing conditions of ſeveral perſons), as to himſelf, none can judge ſave himſelf: and conſequently, neither can they judge of his guilt of Hereſie. Ib.

The V. Conference.

His Plea, for his not being guilty of *Schiſm*. §. 28.

1. THat the Socinian Churches have not forſaken the whole Church Catholick, or the external Communion of it: but only left one part of it that was corrupted; and reformed another part, (i. e.) themſelves. Or, that he, and the Socinian Churches being a part of the Catholick, they have not ſeparated from the whole, becauſe not from themſelves. §. 28.
2. That, their ſeparation being for an error unjuſtly impoſed upon them, as a condition of Communion, the Schiſm is not theirs, who made the ſeparation; but theirs, who cauſed it. §. 29.

Beſides that, what ever the truth of things be; yet ſo long as they are required by any Church to profeſs they believe, what they do not, their ſepa-

separation cannot be said causleſs, and ſo, Schiſm. §. 32.

3. *That, though he, and his party had forſaken the external Communion of all other Churches, yet not the internal; in which they remain ſtill united to them: both in that internal Communion of* charity, *in not condemning all other Churches as non-Catholick; and in that of* Faith, *in all Eſſentials, and Fundamentals, and in all ſuch points, wherein the unity of the Church Catholick conſiſts.* §. 30.

4. *That the doctrine of* Conſubſtantiality *for which they departed is denyed by them to be any Fundamental; nor can the Churches, from which they depart for it, be a competent judge againſt them, that it is ſo.* §. 34.

5. *That, though they are ſeparaters from the Roman, yet not from the Reformed, Churches, which Churches leave men to the liberty of their own judgment; nor require any internal aſſent to their doctrines (in which thing theſe blame the tyranny of the Roman* Church) *ſave only conditional, if any be convinced of the truth thereof; or, not convinced of the contrary.* §. 35.

6. *Inſine; that for enjoying, and continuing in the Proteſtant* Communion *he maketh as full a profeſſion of conformity to her doctrines, as Mr.* Chillingworth *hath done in ſeveral places of his book, which yet was accepted as ſufficient.* §. 41.

THE

The Fourth Discourse.

CONFERENCE I.

The Socinian's *Protestant Plea, for his not holding any thing contrary to the holy Scriptures.*

§. 1. That those things, which have been delivered in the three former discourses, concerning the invalidity of the Protestants Guide for preserving the true faith, and suppressing Heresies, may be clearlier seen, and more seriously considered; I have thought fit in this (for an Example) to shew what Apology a *Socinian*, upon the forementioned Protestant-positions, may return for himself to a Protestant indeavouring to reduce him to the true faith, and using any of these five *motives* thereto; the testimony 1. *of Scriptures*; 2. *Of Catholick Church*; 3. *of her Councils*; 4. The danger of *Heresie*; 5. The danger of *Schism*. In which I would not be thought to go about, to equal all other Protestant-opinions to the malignity of the Socinian errors: but only to shew, that several defences, which, in respect of the former motives, Protestants use for retaining theirs, if these are thought just and reasonable, the Socinians may use the same for much grosser, Tenents.

For, suppose a Protestant, first, concerning the *Scriptures*, question a Socinian in this manner. *Prot.* Why do you, to the great danger of your soul, and salvation, not believe, *God the Son to be of one, and the same essence, and substance with God the Father*, it being so principal an Article of the *Christian* faith, delivered in the *Holy Scriptures?* *Soc.* To give you a satisfactory account of this matter. I do believe, with other Christians, that the Scriptures are the Word of God; and, with other Protestants, that they are a perfect *Rule* of my faith.

§. 2. *Prot.* But this secures you not, unless you believe according to this *Rule*; which, in this point, you do not. *Soc.* However, I believe in this point; truly, or falsly; I am secure, that my faith is entire, as to all *necessary* points of faith. *Prot.* How so? *Soc.* Because, as Mr. *Chillingworth* saith †--*He that believes all that is in the* Bible, *all that is in the* Scriptures *(as I do) believes all that is* necessary *there.*

† p. 23. p. 159 367.

Prot

Prot. This must needs be true: but meanwhile, if there be either some part of Scripture not known at all by you; or the true sence of some part of that you know (for *the Scripture*, as that Author notes †, *is not so much the words, as the sence*) be mistaken by you, how can you say, you believe all the Scriptures: For, when you say, you believe all the Scripture, you mean only this: that you believe, that, whatsoever is the *true sence* thereof, that is *God's Word*; and most certainly true: which belief of yours doth very well consist with your not believing, or also your believing the contrary to, the *true sence* thereof: and then you, not believing the true sence of some part of it at least, may also not believe the true sence of something *necessary* there; which is quite contrary to your conclusion here. † *Chill.* p. 87.

§. 3.

Soc. †—*I believe, that that sence of them which God intendeth, whatsoever it is, is certainly true: And thus I believe implicitely even those very truths, against which I err.* Next: †—*I do my* best indeavour *to believe Scripture in the true sence thereof.* [*By my best indeavour I mean* †, *such a measure of industry, as humane prudence, and ordinary discretion (my abilities, and opportunities, my distractions, and hinderances, and all other things considered) shall advise me unto, in a matter of such consequence.* Of *using* which *endeavour* also, I conceive, I may be sufficiently certain: [for otherwise, I can have no certainty of any thing I believe from this compleat Rule of Scriptures; this due indeavour being the condition, which Protestants require that I shall not be, as to all necessaries, deceived in the sence of Scripture.] Now, being conscious to my self of such a right endeavour used: †—*For me, to believe, further, this or that to be the true sence of some Scriptures; or to believe the true sence of them, and to avoid the false, is not necessary, either to my faith, or salvation. For if God would have had his meaning in these places certainly known, how could it stand with his wisdom, to be so wanting to his own will, and end; as to speak obscurely? Or how can it consist with his justice to require of men to know certainly the meaning of those words which he himself hath not revealed?* †—*For my error or ignorance in what is not plainly contained in Scripture, after my best endeavour used, to say that God will damn me for such errors, who am a lover of him, and lover of truth, is to rob man of his comfort, and God of his goodness; is to make man desperate, and God a tyrant.* † *Chill.* p. 18. † *Chillingw.* p. 102. † *Chill.* p. 18. 92.

§. 4.

Prot. But this defence will no way serve your turn for all points of faith revealed in Scripture: for you ought to have of some points, an *express* and *explicite* faith. *Soc.* Of what points? *Prot.* Of all those that are *fundamental* and *necessary*. *Soc.* Then if this point of *Consubstantiality of the Son* with

with God the Father be none of the *Fundamentals*, and necessaries, wherein I am to have a right, and an explicite faith, the account I have given you already, I hope, is satisfactory.

§. 5. But next: I am secure, that this point, which is the subject of our discourse, at least in the affirmative thereof, is no fundamental; for, according to the Protestant principles † — *The Scripture is a Rule, as sufficiently perfect, so sufficiently intelligible in things necessary, to all that have understanding; whether learned, or unlearned. Neither is any thing necessary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed: for to say, that when a place of Scripture, by reason of ambiguous terms lies indifferent between divers senses, whereof one is true, and the other false, that God obligeth men under pain of damnation not to mistake through error, and humane frailty, is to make God a tyrant, and to say that he requires of us certainty to attain that end, for the attaining whereof, we have no certain means. In fine* †, *where Scriptures are plain, as they are in necessaries, they need no infallible Interpretor, no further explanation* [to me]; *and where they are not plain, there if I, using diligence to find the truth, do yet miss of it, and fall into error, there is no danger in it.* *Prot.* True. Such necessary points are clear to the unlearned, using a due industry, void of a contrary interest, *&c.* *Soc.* And in such industry I may be assured, I have not been deficient: having bestowed much study on this matter, read the controversie on both sides; compared Texts, *&c.* (as also appears in the diligent writings of others of my perswasion); and after all this, the sence of Scripture also, which I embrace, (a sence, you know, decried and persecuted by most Christians) is very contrary to all my secular relations, interest, and profit.

† Chill. p. 92.

† Chill. p. 59

Now, after all this search I have used, I am so far satisfied, that this point, on the affirmative side, is not clear, and evident in Scripture (and therefore no Fundamental), that I can produce most clear, and evident places out of the Scriptures (if a man can be certain of any thing from the perspicuity of its expressions) that the contrary of it is so.

See *Crellius* in the preface to his book *de uno Deo Patre* — 'Hæc *de uno Deo Patre sententia* plurimis, *ac* clarissimis *sacrarum literarum testimoniis nititur* — Evidens *sententiæ veritas, & rationum* 'firmissimarum *è sacris literis sponte subnascentium* multitudo, *ingenii* 'nostri tenuitatem sublevat, *&c* — *Argumenta, quæ ex sacris literis de-* 'prompsimus, *per se* plana *sunt, ac* facilia *adeo quidem, ut eorum vim* 'declinare aliâ ratione non possint adversarii, quam ut à verborum sim- 'plicitate tum ipsi deflectant, tum nos abducere conentur. And see the 'particular places of Scripture which they urge (where, as to the 'expression, & other texts being laid aside, that seems to be said, as it were,

'were *totidem verbis*, which the Socinians maintain): *Joh.* 14. 28. '17. 3. *Ep.* 1 *Cor.* 8. 6.—*Col.* 1. 15. *& Rev.* 3. 14. I set not down this, to countenance their cause, but to shew their confidence.]

§. 7.

Prot. O strange presumption! And is not your judgment, then, liable to mistake in the true sence of these Scriptures, because you strongly perswade your self, they are most evident on your side? *Soc.* 'Tis true, that I may *mistake* in the sence of *some* Scripture; but it follows not from hence, that I can be *certain* of the sence of *no* Scriptures. To answer you in the words of Mr. *Chillingworth* † —*Though I pretend not to certain means in interpreting all Scripture, particularly such places, as are obscure, and ambiguous, yet this methinks should be no impediment, but that we may have certain means of not erring in, and about the sence of those places which are so plain, and clear, that they need no Interpreters; and in such this my faith is contained. If you ask me, how I can be sure, that I know the true meaning of these places? I ask you again; can you be sure, you understand, what I, or any man else saith? They, that heard our Saviour and the Apostles preach, can they have sufficient assurance, that they understood at any time, what they would have them do? If not; to what end did they hear them? If they could; why may not I be as well assured, that I understand sufficiently, what I conceive plain in their writings?* Again; I pray tell me whether do you certainly know the sence of these Scriptures, for the evidence of which you separated from the Church before *Luther*, requiring conformity to the contrary doctrines, as a condition of her Communion? *If you do, then give us leave to have the same means, and the same abilities to know other plain places, which you have to know these. For if all Scripture be obscure, how can you know the sence of these places? If some places of it be plain, why should I stay here?* —† *If you ask, seeing I may possibly err, how can I be assured, I do not? I ask you again; seeing your eye-sight may deceive you, how can you be sure, you see the Sun, when you do see it?* † *A Judge may possibly err in judgment, can he therefore never have assurance, that he hath judged rightly? A Traveller may possibly mistake his way; must I therefore be doubtful, whether I am in the right way from my Hall to my Chamber? Or can our* London *Carrier have no certainty in the middle of the day, when he is sober, and in his wits, that he is in his way to* London —† *This I am certain of; that God will not require of me a certainly unerring belief, unless he hath given me a certain means to avoid error; and, if I use those, which I have, will never require of me, that I use that which I have not* † —This is Mr. *Chillingworth's* solid plea against the Papist's grand objection, for the proving an uncertainty in the Protestant's faith upon any their pretence of *evident* Scripture.

† Chilling. p. 111.

† Id. p. 112.

† Ib. p. 117.

† Id. p. 112.

† See also Chilling. p. 140. 366. 307.

§. 8. *Prot.* But the Scriptures, which you urge againſt *the Son's being the ſame one only God with God the Father*, carry not the ſame evidence, and clearneſs, as thoſe Scriptures do, whereon Proteſtants build the certainty of their faith againſt the Papiſts, or againſt the common Church-doctrines that were before *Luther*. *Soc.* That ſay the Papiſts of your plain Scriptures, which you of mine: I pray, what can be ſaid more plain, or in what point, in your opinion, more fundamental (wherein we contend Scripture is moſt clear, even to the unlearned), than this, in *Joh.* 17. 3.—*Ut cognoſcant te* [Pater] *ſolum verum Deum; &, quem miſiſti, Jeſum Chriſtum*—And, 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *Unus Deus, Pater; & unus Dominus Jeſus.* And, *Eph.* 4. *ver.* 5. *Unus eſt Dominus*, [i. e. *Jeſus*; and then *ver.* 6. *Unus eſt Deus, & Pater omnium*——And *Joh.* 14. 1. *Creditis in Deum, & in me credite*—And *ver.* 28. *Pater meus major me eſt.* I ſay, what more clear for proving the Father his being the *true, moſt high*, God, and excluding the other perſons [the *Son*, or the *holy Ghoſt*] from being the very ſame God. *Prot.* And [1] what more clear, on the other ſide, than theſe Texts, *Rom.* 9. 5. *Of whom, as concerning the fleſh, Chriſt came, who is, over all, God bleſſed for ever*—And, *Tit.* 2. 13. † 1 *Joh.* 5. 20. *The glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour, Jeſus Chriſt.* And †—*We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt. This is the true God and eternal life*, ſpoken by S. *John*, the great vindicator, againſt *Ebion*, *Cerinthus*, *Cerpocrates*, and others in his time, †*S. Hieron. de viris illuſt.* oppoſers of our Lord's Divinity †—And *Apoc.* 1. 8. compared with 1. 17.—*I am* Alpha *and* Omega, *the beginning and the ending, which is and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* I ſay, what more clear than theſe Texts, for ſhewing the *true Deity* of Chriſt. [2] And then, how many other clear Texts are there, aſſerting the *Eternity* of our Lord; that he is nothing made or created, but preexiſtent before the conſtitution of the world; equal with God; & that heaven, and earth, and all things were made by him, that were made; and that he deſcended from heaven from his Father, when he took our nature upon him. See *Joh.* 1. 1. &c.—3. 13. *Heb.* 1. 2, 3, 10. &c.—*Joh.* 17. 5, 24.—*Phil.* 2. 6.—*Joh.* 6. 38.—16. 28.—1 *Tim.* 3. 16.—*Heb.* 2. 14. And [3] then, his *Deity* and *Eternity* thus cleared; his Deity can be no other, than, in the total eſſence thereof, numerically the ſame with that of God the Father. For thoſe of your own Sect, together with the whole Chriſtian world, do acknowledge, [1] That there is but one numerical moſt high God, an inſeparable attribute of whom is the Creation of the world, and his preexiſtence before it. And again; [2] That the ſubſtance or eſſence of this moſt high God, is not any way diviſible, partible, or multipliable; ſo that, *Si Chriſtus ex Dei ſubſtantiâ generatus fuit, to-*

ta

ta ei Patris substantia, eadem numero, communicata fuit. See *Volkel. de vera Rel. l.* 5. *c.* 12. upon which consequence well discerned, your predecessors were constrained to desert Arrianism, or semi-Arrianism, and to take in other respects a more deserate way, of denying any pre-existence of our Lord before his Incarnation: To return, then, to our business. All Scripture being equally true; you know, no Text thereof can be pronounced clear in such a sence, which others, as clear, contradict. The non-consideration of which, by the passionate or unlearned, is the mother of all errors. The Texts therefore that you produce here to manifest on your side, that they may not contradict many more others as clear against you, are to be understood to speak of our Lord only according to his *Incarnation*, *Messias*-and *Mediator-ship*, in which he hath an inferiority to the Father, and is our *Lord*, by a special Redemption with his blood, in another manner, than he together with his Father, in the same essence, is the one true God. *Soc.* All the Texts you have mentioned have been diligently considered, and answered, by our party. *Prot.* And your answer's, new, forced, absurd, as may clearly appear to any rational and indifferent person perusing *Volkelius* l. 5. from the 10. to the 14. Chapter. But to omit this dispute, as now beside my purpose. If your sence of the Scriptures you have urged be so manifest, and clear, as you pretend; how comes so great a part of the Christian world (doubtless rational men) in the sence of these very Scriptures so much to differ from you? Therefore here I cannot but still suppose in you the defect of a *due industry*, well comparing these Scriptures, and void of pride, passion, and other interest. *Soc.* And I return the like question to you. If, on the clearness of the express sence of these Scriptures, I cannot infallibly ground my faith, against many other rational men contradicting; on what plainness of the sence of any other Scripture is it, that Protestants can ground theirs, against a contrary sence given by the learned; by several Councils; by the whole Church of some ages; as they do; not promising to the Councils, even to the four first, an absolute, but conditional assent, *viz.* only so far, as their decrees agree with these clear Scriptures? If neither the plain words of Scripture can afford a sufficient certainty to me in this matter, which Scriptures, you say, in fundamentals are to all perspicuous (and such do many deem this point); nor I can have a sufficient assurance of using an unbiast industry in the understanding of these Scriptures, and also in the comparing them with others, in which I am conscious to my self of no neglect, I see no sufficient ground of my presuming to understand any other part of Scripture: and then, wherein can lye the

assurance of a Protestant's faith, for his not erring in *Fundamentals* at least? Bishop *Lany* tells me †, *That, when we have certain knowledge of a thing, we may safely learn from the Schools*, viz. *Ubi non est formido contrarii; that after diligent search, and inquiry when there remains no scruple, doubt, and fear of the contrary, when the understanding is fixt, we are said to be certain — And that they who will say it, and do think so too, may safely be absolved from the guilt of disobedience.* Prot. † *You have a judgment of discretion I grant, and may interpret Scripture for your self: without the use of which judgement you cannot serve God with a reasonable service, who are also to give account of your self, and are to be saved by your own faith, and do perish upon your own score.* — † *None may usurp that royal prerogative of heaven in prescribing infallibly in matters questioned, but leave all to judge according to the pandects of the divine laws, because each member of this Society, is bound to take care of his soul, and of all things that tend thereto* — † *In matters of Religion, when the question is, whether any man be a fit judge, and chooser for himself, we suppose men honest, and such as understand the difference between a moment, and eternity. And then I suppose that all the necessary points in Religion are plain, and easie, and consequently every man in this case to be a compleat judge for himself, because it concerns himself to judge aright, as much as eternal happiness is worth: and if through his own default he judge amiss, he alone shall suffer for it.* To God's righteous judgment therefore I must finally remit you. At your own peril be it. This of the Socinians plea concerning the Scripture on his side.

† *Serm. at Whitehall, March* 12. 1664. p. 17.

† Dr. *Ferne Division of Churches*, p. 47, 61 -- *Chillingw.* p. 57.

† *Stilling f.* p. 133.

† *Chillingw.* p. 59, 100.

§. 9. Where the self-clearness of the sence of Scriptures, not mistakable in Fundamentals, or necessaries, upon a due industry used (of which also rightly used, men may be sufficiently assured) being made the ground, as you see; of the Protestants, and Socinians faith, before these two proceed to any further conference, give me leave to interpose a word between them, concerning this certainty so much spoken of, and presumed on.

§. 10. And here first; from this way, lately taken by many Protestants, there seems to be something necessarily consequent, which I suppose they will by no means allow; *viz.* That, instead of the Roman Church her setting up some men, (the Church Governors), as infallible in necessaries, here is set up by them every Christian, if he will, both infallible in all necessaries; and certain, that he is so. For the Scripture, they affirm, most clear in all necessaries to all using a due industry; and of this due industry they also affirm; men may be certain, that they have used it; it being, not all, *possible*, endeavour; but such a measure thereof *as ordinary discretion, &c. adviseth to.* (See Mr. *Chillingworth*, p. 19.) And next, from this affirmed;

firmed; that, every one may be ſo certain in all Fundamentals, it muſt be maintained alſo; that their ſpiritual Guides, in a conjunction of them, nay more, every ſingle Prelate, or Presbyter, if they are not, yet may be, an infallible Guide to the people in all Points neceſſary. And therefore Mr. *Chillingworth* freely thus vindicates it † —*That theſe alſo may be both in Fundamentals, and alſo in ſome points unfundamental, both certain of the infallibility of their Rule, and that they do manifeſtly proceed according to it: and then, in what they are certain that they cannot be miſtaken, they may* (ſaith he †) *lawfully decide the controverſies about them, and without raſhneſs propoſe their decrees, as* certain, divine, *Revelations; and excommunicate, anathematize alſo any man perſiſting in the contrary error.* And there ſeems reaſon in ſuch *Anathema*; becauſe all others either do, or may know the truth of the ſame decrees by the ſame certain means, as theſe Governors do. Now then: what certainty the Guides of a particular Church may have, I hope may alſo thoſe of the Church Catholick: and then, obedience being yielded to theſe by all their inferiors, this will reſtore all things to their right courſe. All this follows upon certainty, [1] That Scriptures are plain in Fundamentals; And [2] that due induſtry is uſed to underſtand them. But, if you ſhould deny, that men can have a *certainty* of their induſtry *rightly uſed*; then again, is all the fair ſecurity theſe men promiſe their followers of their not erring in neceſſaries, quite vaniſhed.

† p. 140. † p. 118, 140. & 166.

But now to paſs from this conſequence, (to which I know not what can be ſaid), and to enquire a litle after the true grounds of our certainty in any thing, which is here ſo much pretended.

1ſt. It cannot be denyed, that he, that doth err in one thing, may be certain, that he doth not err in ſome other; becauſe he may have ſufficient ground, and means for his not erring in one thing, which he hath not in another. Nor again denyed, that he, who poſſibly may err, yet in the ſame thing may be certain, that he doth not err, if not neglecting ſome means, which he knows will certainly keep him from error.

2. But, notwithſtanding theſe: This ſeems alſo neceſſary to be granted on the other ſide (and is ſo by learned Proteſtants). That, in what kind of knowledge ſoever it be (whether of our *ſence*, or *reaſon*, in whatever *Art*, or *Science*) one can never *rightly* aſſure himſelf concerning his own knowledge, that he is certain of any thing for a *truth*, which all, or moſt others, of the ſame, or better abilities for their cognoſcitive faculties, in all the ſame external means, or grounds of the knowledge thereof, do pronounce an *error*. Not, as if truth were not ſo, though all the world oppoſe it; nor had certain grounds to be proved ſo, though all the world ſhould deny

§. 11.

them; but becauſe the true knowledge of it, and them, cannot poſſibly appear to one mans intellect: and, *omnibus paribus*, not to others. Now for any diſparity, as to defect, whether in the *inſtrument*, or in the *means* of knowledge, there, where all, or moſt differ from me, it ſeems a ſtrange pride not to imagine this defect in my ſelf, rather than them; eſpecially, *whenas all the grounds of my Science are communicated to them; and * whenas, for my own miſtakes, I cannot know exactly the extent of ſupernatural deluſions. I ſay, be this in what knowledge we pleaſe; in that of ſence, *ſeeing*, *hearing*, *numbring*, or in any of Mr. *Chillingworth's* former inſtances mentioned §. 7. So, I can never rationally aſſure my ſelf of what I ſee, when men, as well, or better ſighted, and all external circumſtances for any thing I know being the ſame, ſee no ſuch matter. And this is the Rule alſo propoſed by learned Proteſtants to keep every Phanatick from pleading certainty in his own conceit. See Arch-Bp. *Lawd* (p. 33. Conſid 5. n. 1.)—and *Hooker* (Preface §. 6.) their defining of a clear evidence, or demonſtrative argument, *viz. Such, as propoſed to* any man, *and underſtood, the mind cannot chuſe but inwardly aſſent to it*; and therefore, ſurely propoſed to many men, the mind of the moſt cannot diſſent from it.

§. 12. Conſequently, in the Scripture; abſtracting from the inward operations of God's holy Spirit, and any external infallible Guide, (which infallible Guide Scripture it ſelf cannot be to *two* men differing in the ſence thereof): I ſee not, from whence any certainty can ariſe to particular perſons, for ſo many Texts, or places thereof, concerning the ſence of which, the moſt, or the moſt learned, or their Superiors, to whom alſo all their motives, or arguments are repreſented, do differ from them. From the plainneſs of the expreſſion or Grammatical conſtruction of the words, ſuch certainty cannot ariſe; unleſs no term thereof can poſſibly be diſtinguiſhed, or taken in a diverſe or unliteral ſence; but, if it cannot be ſo taken, then all Expoſitors muſt needs agree in one, and the ſame ſence. For example. For the *literal*, and *Grammatical* ſence, what Text plainer, than [*Hoc eſt corpus meum*], and yet Proteſtants underſtand it otherwiſe? Very deficient therefore ſeemeth that anſwer of Mr. *Chillingworth's* to *Fr. Knot* †, urging: *That the firſt Reformers ought to have doubted, whether their opinions were certain — Which is to ſay* (anſwers he), *that they ought to have doubted of the certainty of Scripture; which* in formal, and expreſs terms, *contains many of their opinions* [whenas the greater world of Catholicks ſees no ſuch matter]. Beſides; as there is no term almoſt in any ſentence, but that is capable of ſeveral acceptions; ſo, ſince no falſhood, no diſcord is in the Scriptures, there is no ſentence in

† Chill. p. 307

it,

it, however sounding for the expression, but must be reconciled in its sence to all the rest; and for this a diligent comparing of Texts is necessary, to attain the true meaning of many places, that seem, at the first sight, most clear in what they say, but that there are also other places as clear, that seem to say the contrary: And some such places it was, (and that in very necessary points too) of which S. *Peter* saith; *That some wrested them to their own damnation: wrested them*, because they wanted (not industry, but) learning; *which the unlearned* (saith he) *wrest*——And indeed commonly the most ignorant have the stronglieſt-conceited certainty for what they apprehend or believe, because they know fewest reasons against it; whilst, by much study, and comparing several Revelations one with another, those come at last to doubt, or deny that sence of some of them, which at the first they took for most certainly, and evidently true. Pardon this long Parenthesis. † 2 *Pet.* 3. 16.

CONFERENCE II.

2. *The Socinians Protestant-Plea, For his not holding any thing contrary to the unanimous sence of the Catholick Church, so far as this can justly oblige.*

5. 13.

2. Now to resume the *Conference*. The *Protestant*, better thinking on it, will not leave the *Socinian* thus at rest in this plerophory of his own sence of *Scripture*; but thus proceeds.

Prot. Scriptures indeed are not so clear, and perspicuous to every one † *as that Art, and subtilty may not be used to pervert the Catholick doctrine, and to wrest the plain places of Scripture, which deliver it, so far from their proper meaning, that very few ordinary capacities may be able to clear themselves of such mists as are cast before their eyes, even* in the great Articles of the Christian faith. Therefore why do not you submit your judgment and assent to *the sence of Scripture*, in this point *unanimously delivered by the consent of the Catholick Church*; which also is believed alwayes unerrable in any necessary point of faith; as this is? *Soc.* First. If you can shew me *an unanimous consent* of the Church Catholick of all ages in this point, and that as held necessary, I will willingly submit to it. But this you can * never do according to such a proof thereof, as is required, viz. † *That all Catholick Writers agree in the belief of it; and none of them oppose it: and agree also in the belief of the necessity of it to all Christians.* * *That no later Writers, and Fathers, in opposition of Hereticks, or heats of contention, judged then the Article so exposed* † *Stillingf.* p. 58, 59.

† *Stillingf.* p. 57.

posed to be more necessary, than it was judged before the contention. * *That all Writers, that give an account of the faith of Christians, deliver it: And deliver it, not as necessary to be believed by such as might be convinced that it is of divine Revelation, but with a necessity of its being explicitely believed by all.* See before Disc. 3. §. 52. Now, no such unanimous consent can be pretended for *Consubstantiality*. For, (not to speak of the times next following the Council of *Nice*, nor yet, of several expressions in the ancients, *Justin Martyr*, *Irœneus*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, that seem to favour our opinion † : Nor, of those Eastern Bishops, which *Arrius*, in his letter to *Eusebius Nicomed* ||, numbers on his side), *Hilarius* † relates, no less than eighty Bishops, before that Council, to have disallowed the reception of the word ὁμοούσιος; and, in the Council also, seventeen (some of note) at first to have dissented from the rest.

† *See Petavius in Epiphan. Hær. 69*

|| *Apud Epiphan. Hær. 69 — Theodoret. l. 1. c. 5.*

† *De Synodis.*

§. 14.

Prot. Not yielding what you say for truth; but, for the present, supposing it; yet the judgment of so *small* a *party* may by no means be adhered to by you, it being inconsiderable in respect of the *whole Body* of the Catholick Church declaring against you.

Soc. If the consent of the much major part is to be taken for the whole, then the reformed cannot maintain their dissent from the much more numerous body of Christianity, that opposed their opinions, and sence of Scriptures, at the beginning of the Reformation, and do still oppose them. But, not to stand upon this, I would willingly conform to the unanimous, or most general judgement of the Church Catholick; if I were secure that she could not be mistaken in it. But † *The sence of the Church Catholick is no infallible rule of interpreting Scripture in all things which concern the rule of faith* — † *Nor may she usurp that royal prerogative of heaven, in prescribing infallibly in matters questioned.* *Prot.* You may be secure, that she never erreth in any point *necessary*. *Soc.* But you tell me, that, though she never err in necessaries, yet it follows not, that she is an *unerring Guid*, or *witness* therein †: or, *that she must unerringly declare, what points are necessary, and what not*; and I must first learn, whether this point of *Consubstantiality* is to be numbred among *necessaries*, before I can be assured, that the sence of the Church Catholick errs not therein.

† *Stillingf.* p. 59.

† *Stillingf.* p. 133.

† *Stillingf.* p. 154, 252. — *Chilling.* p. 150. — *Dr. Hammond Defence of the L. Falkl.* p. 23.

§. 15.

Prot. But † *It is a sufficient prescription against any thing which can be alledged out of Scripture, that it ought not to be looked on as the true meaning of Scripture, if it appear contrary to the sence of the Church Catholick from the beginning; and therefore such doctrines may well be judged destructive to the rule of faith, which have been so unanimously condemned by the Church Catholick.* *Soc.* Why so?

† *Stillingf.* p. 58.

† *Stillingf. ib.* *Prot.* † *Because nothing contrary to the necessary Articles of faith*

can

can be held by the Catholick Church; for its very Being depends on its belief of necessaries to salvation. *Soc.* This last is most true; but then, if you mean to make your discourse cohere, you must say, it is a sufficient prescription, &c. if it appear contrary to the sence of the Catholick Church, *viz. in a point necessary*: for the reason you give carries, and secures you no further; and then, that which you say is no great matter: For, here we are still to seek, whether the point we discourse of, is in the affirmative, such a *necessary*.

§. 16.

Prot. But this is ranked among those points which the Church hath put in her Creeds. *Soc.* From the beginning this Article was not in the Creed; and, though it should be granted, that all points necessary are contained in the Creeds, yet all in the Creeds are not thought points necessary: † *Necessary so, as to be believed by any before a clear conviction of the divine Revelation thereof*: which conviction I yet want.

† *Stillingf.* p. 70. 71.

§. 17.

Prot. But yet, though first the Catholick Church may err in *non-necessaries*; and 2ly, in what points are *necessary*, what not, her judgment be not infallible, yet you have still great reason to submit your judgment to hers; because, if it happen to be a point necessary, she is from the divine Promise infallible and unerring in it; not so, you. And 2ly. If not necessary, and so both she and you therein liable to error, yet you much the more, and she also in these things is appointed by God for your Teacher, and Guide.

Soc. Therefore I use the help, and direction of my spiritual Guides; consider their reasons; do not rashly depart from their judgement; but yet † *The due submission of my assent, and belief to them is only to be conditional, with reservation of evidence in God's Word. For in matter of faith,* (as Dr. *Ferne* saith), *I cannot submit to any company of men by resignation of my judgment and belief to receive for faith all, that they shall define, for such resignation stands excluded by the condition of the authority which is not infallible; and by the condition of the matter, faith, of high concernment to our own souls, and to be accounted for by* our selves: *who therefore stand bound to make present, and diligent search for that evidence and demonstration from God's Word, upon which we may finally, and securely stay our belief* — And † — *The Church determining matter of faith* (saith he) *ought to manifest it out of* God's Word: *and we may expect such proof, before we yield absolute assent of belief.* And so Mr. *Stillingfleet* saith † — *All men ought to be left to judge according to the Pandects of the divine Laws, because each member of this Society is bound to take care of his soul, and of all things that tend thereto.* Now I for my part see no solid ground out of the Scripture for *Consubstantiality*, but rather for the contrary; which several of our Writers have made appear

† Dr. *Ferne Considerations* p. 19.

† *The Case between the Churches.* p. 40.

† p. 133.

to the world. And therefore unleſs the Church were either infallible in all ſhe determined, or at leaſt in diſtinguiſhing thoſe neceſſaries wherein ſhe cannot err, from the reſt, it ſeems no way juſtifiable, that ſhe puts this her definition into the Creed; ſhe as I conceive, thus requiring from all an abſolute conſent thereto; and not only (as ſome † would perſwade me) a conditional, for ſome of them; *viz.* whenever I ſhall be clearly convinced, that ſuch point is of divine Revelation.

† *Still. p.* 70.

CONFERENCE III.

3. *Or contrary to the Definitions of lawful General Councils, the juſt conditions thereof being obſerved.*

§. 18. 3. PROT. But do you not conſider, by what perſons this Article was long ago inſerted into the Creed: Namely, by the *firſt General*, and the moſt venerable, aſſembly of the *Fathers* of the Church that hath been convened ſince the *Apoſtles* times; celebrated under the *firſt Chriſtian Emperor* by a perfect repreſentative of the Catholick Church; and by ſuch perſons, as came very much purified out of the newly-quenched fire of the greateſt perſecution, that the Church hath ſuffered, that under *Diocleſian*; will not you then at laſt ſubmit your judgment to the Decree of this great, and holy Council; one and the firſt, of thoſe four which, S. *Gregory* ſaid, he received with the ſame reverence, as the four Goſpels.

Soc. No: And for this I ſhall give you in brief many reaſons, as I conceive, ſatisfactory. For 1ſt. Had I an obligation of ſubmiſſion of judgement to lawful General Councils, you cannot prove this ſuch a one, and thoſe the decrees thereof, which are now extant, with ſuch a certainty, as is neceſſary to build thereon an Article of my faith. For, to prove this, you muſt ſatisfie me in all thoſe things queſtioned concerning General Councils * by Mr. *Chillingworth*, p. 94. * By Dr. *Pierce* in his anſwer to Mr. *Creſſy*, p. 18. &c. * By Mr. *Whitby* from p. 428. to p. 433. [where he concludes: 1ſt. *That we never had a General Council.* 2ly. *That a General Council is a thing impoſſible*] —* By Mr. *Stillingfleet* p. 508. &c.—495. 119—123. &c. Who alſo, againſt the being of ſuch a General Council as is the repreſentative of the whole Church Catholick, thus diſputes† —*The repreſentation of a Church* (ſaith he) *by a General Council, is a thing not ſo evident, from whence it ſhould come: for if ſuch repreſentative of the whole Church there be, it muſt either be ſo by ſome formal act of the Church, or by a tacite conſent. It could not*

† *p.* 515. 516.

be

be by any formal act of the Church; for then there must be some such act of the universal Church preceding the being of any General Council, by which they receive their Commission to appear in behalf of the universal Church. Now that the universal Church did ever agree in any such act is utterly impossible to be demonstrated, either that it could be, or that it was. But if it be said, that such a formal act is not necessary, but the tacite consent of the whole Church is sufficient for it; then such a consent of the Church must be made evident, by which they did devolve over the power of the whole Church to such a Representative. And all those must consent in that act, whose power the Council pretends to have; of which no footsteps appear ——*The utmost then* (saith he) *that can be supposed in this case, is, that the parts of the Church may voluntarily consent to accept of the decrees of such a Council; and, by that voluntary act, or by the supreme authority enjoyning it, such decrees may become obligatory.* Thus he. But I suppose its decrees obligatory, then, only to those parts of the Church, that voluntarily consent to accept of them, which the *Arrians* did not to receive the *Decrees* of *Nice*. 2ly. Though it be shewed a lawful General Council, representing the whole Church (as it ought, if such) yet what obligation can there lye upon me of consenting to it? since it may *err* even in *Fundamentals*; if it be not universally accepted, as indeed this Council was not, for several Bishops there were, that were dissenters in the Council, and many more afterward.† 3ly. Were it universally accepted; yet unless you can shew me by some means, that this point, wherein I differ from its judgment, is a fundamental, or necessary point to salvation, both it, and the Catholick Church also that accepts it, may err therein. 4ly. The judgement of this Council seems justly declinable also on this account. That whereas the *Guides* of the *Church*, many years before this Council, were divided in their opinion, *Alexander* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and *Hosius* a Favourite of the *Emperors* heading one party; and *Arrius*, and the *Bishops* adhering to him, whom I mentioned formerly †, heading another, and whereas afterward, in the prosecution of this difference, both the foresaid *Alexander* in one *Provincial Council* held in *Egypt*, and *Hosius* sent thither by the Emperor in another, had there condemned *Arrius*, and his Confederates; yet so it was ordered, that in this General Council assembled for an equal hearing, and decision of this Controversie, of these two professed Enemies to the other party; the one (*Hosius*) was appointed to sit as President of this Council; and the other (*Alexander*) held in it the next place to him; and poor *Arrius*, excluded; and the Bishops, who favoured him in the Council, though at first freely declaring their dissent, yet at last over-awed to a subscription;

† See before § 13.

† §. 13.

as also was *Arrius* himself chiefly by the Emperor *Constantine's* overbearing authority; who, before somewhat indifferent in the conteſt, yet, upon *Arrius* his undutiful, and too peremptory letters, had, some years before, taken great offence at him; and also, (as he was very eloquent) publickly written against him †. Which *overawing* hence appears, in that the same *Bishops* that were adherents to *Arrius*, when, this Emperor being deceased, *Constantius* his son countenanced their cause, returned, I say not to their former opinion only, but to their publick profession of it. By which we may guess, that if the Controversie had at that time been committed to equal, and disingaged Judges, and such as had not formerly shewed themselves a party: or, if the Oriental Bishops, without any fear of the Prince upon them, might have given free votes, and the *Arrian* cause, then had a *Constantius* instead of a *Constantine*, (things, wherein Protestants well understand me, because on the same grounds they have rejected the Council of *Trent*) we may presume, then the issue would have been under *Constantine* the same, that it was under his Successor. I say before Judges equal, and indifferent, and not such as were, before, a party, though this party should be compounded of the chief superior Prelates of the Church. For as Mr. *Stillingfleet* urgeth † — *we must either absolutely, and roundly assert, that it is impossible, that the superiors in the Church may be guilty of any error, or corruption; or that, if they be, they must never be called to an account for it; or else, that it may be just, in some cases, to except against them as parties. And if in some cases, then the question comes to this; whether the present* [he speaks of Idolatry, I of Consubstantiality] *be some of those cases, or no? And here if we make those superiors Judges again, what you grant before comes to nothing.* *Prot.* I perceive Mr. *Chillingworth's* observation is right. † *That, in controversies in Religion, it is in a manner impossible to be avoided, but the Judge must be a party*: [I add also, that in matters of Religion, where every man is concerned, and in great Controversies, especially where is any division of Communion, all both *Laity*, and *Clergy* speedily own, and range themselves on one side, or other; *Clergy* interessing themselves for the necessary direction of their *Subjects*; *Laity*, in obedience to their *Superiors*; neither can such a Judge be nominated, that is not to one side suspected. So that in controversies of Religion, we must deny any Judge (as he did †): or this plea that the ordinary Judge, that is assigned us, as is a *party*, must not be easily hearkened to.

† See *Baronius*. A.D. 318, 319.

† p. 478.

Y. add. end. p. 366.

† p. 60.

† Ib. §. 17.

§. 19.

Soc. But I have not yet said all. For 5ly. Were there none of the forenamed defects in it, † *No authority on earth can oblige to internal assent in matters of faith, or to any farther obedience, than*

† *Whitby* p. 15 — *Stillingf.* p. 506. 537.

that of silence. *Prot.* Yes, you stand obliged to yield a *conditional* assent at least to the Definitions of these highest Courts, *i. e.* unless you can bring evident *Scriptures*, or *Demonstration* against them. *Soc.* I do not think Protestant *Divines* agree in this. I find indeed the Arch-Bp. † requiring evidence, and demonstration for inferiors *contradicting*, or publishing their dissent, from the Councils decrees, but not requiring thus much for their *denial* of *assent*: and I am told ‖ —*That in matters proposed by my Superiors, as* God's Word, *and of* faith, *I am not tyed to believe it such, till they manifest it to me to be* so; *and not, that I am to believe it such, unless I can manifest it to be* contrary, *because my faith can rest on no humane authority, but only on God's Word, and divine Revelation.* And Dr. *Field* saith † —*It is not necessary expresly to believe whatsoever the Council hath concluded, though it be true; unless by some other means it appear unto us to be true, and we be convinced of it in some other sort than by the bare determination of the Council.* Till I am convinced then of my error, the obedience of *silence* is the most, that can be required of me.

† §. 32 n. 5. & §. 33. Con-sid. 5. n. 1.

‖ Dr. Ferne *Case between the Churches* p. 48. 49. & *Division of Churches.* p. 45.

† p. 666.

§. 20.

But 6ly. I conceive my self in this point not obliged to this neither; considering my present perswasion, that this Council *manifestly* erred; and that, in an error of such high consequence (concerning the *unity* of the *most high God*) as is no way to be tolerated; and I want not evident Scriptures, and many other unanswerable Demonstrations to shew it did so; and therefore being admitted into the honourable function of the Ministery, I conceive I have a lawful Commission from an *higher authority*, to publish this great truth of *God*, and to contradict the *Councils* decree.

§. 21.

Prot. But you may easily mistake that for *evident Scripture*, and those for *Demonstrations*, that are not. Concerning which you know, what the Arch-Bp. and Mr. *Hooker* say † —*That they are such, as proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot chuse, but inwardly assent to them* †. You ought therefore first to propose these to your Superiors, or to the Church, desiring a redress of such error by her calling another Council. And if these *Superiors*, acquainted therewith, dislike your demonstrations, which, the definition saith, if they be right ones, they must be by all, and therefore by them, assented to, methinks, (though this is not said by the Arch-Bp.) in humility you ought also to suspect these Demonstrations, and remain in silence at least, and no further trouble the Church. *Soc.* May therefore no particular person, or Church proceed to a Reformation of a former doctrin, if these Superiors, first complained to, declare the grounds of such persons, or Churches, for it, not sufficient. *Prot.* I must not say so. But if they neglect, (as they may)

† *Ap.* Lawd. 245.

† *Id.* p. 227.

may) to consider their *just* reasons so diligently as they ought, and to call a Council for the correcting of such error according to the weight of these reasons, then here is place for inferiors to proceed to a reformation of such error without them. *Soc.* And who then shall judge, whether the reasons pretended are *defective*, or rather the present Church *negligent* in considering them? *Prot.* Here, I confess, to make *the Superiors* Judges of this, is to cast the Plaintiff before that any Council shall hear his grievance, these Superiors, whose faith appears to adhere to the former Council, being only Judges in their own cause; and so the liberty of complaining will come to nothing †. *Soc.* The inferiors then, that complain, I suppose, are to judge of this. To proceed then. To these Superiors in many diligent writings we have proposed, as we think, many unanswerable Scriptures, and reasons much advanced beyond those represented by our party to the former *Nicen* Council (and therefore from which evidences of ours we have just cause to hope from a future Council a contrary sentence); and finding no redress by their calling another Council for a reviewing this point, we cannot but conceive it as lawful for a Socinian Church; Pastor, or Bishop, for to reform for themselves, and the souls committed to them in an error appearing to them *manifest*, and *intolerable*: as for the Protestants, or for Dr. *Luther*, to have done the same for Transubstantiation, Sacrifice of the Mass, and other points that have been concluded, against the truth, by several former Councils. *Prot.* But such were not *lawful General Councils*, as that of *Nice* was. *Soc.* Whatever these Councils were, this much matters not, as to a *reformation* from them: for had they been lawfully General, yet Protestants hold †, these not universally accepted may err even in *Fundamentals*; or when so accepted, yet may err, in non-fundamentals, errors *manifest*, and *intolerable*, and so may be appealed from to future; and, those not called, their error presently rectified by such parts of Christianity, as discern it; and also S. *Austine* † is frequently quoted by them, saying—*That past General Councils erring, may be corrected by other Councils following.*

†*Still.* p 479. 292.

†See before *Disc.* 3. §. 34. *&c.*

† *De Baptismo* 2 l. 3 c. §. 22.

Prot. But I pray you consider, if that famous Council of *Nice*, hath so erred, another Council called may it also not err, notwithstanding your evidences proposed to it? For, though perhaps some new Demonstrative proofs you may pretend from several Texts more accurately compared, and explained; yet you will not deny this sufficient evidence to have been extant for that most learned Council to have seen the truth, having then the same entire rule of faith as you now the Scriptures, (in which, you say, your clearest evidences lye), for their direction. When a future Council

(then)

(then) is assembled, and hath heard your plea, will you *assent* to it, and acquiesce in the judgment thereof? *Soc.* Yes; interposing the Protestant-conditions of assent, *if its decree be according to God's Word, and we convinced thereof.* *Prot.* Why; such a submission of judgement, and assent I suppose you will presently yield to me in any thing, whereof you are convinced by me; may this future Council, then, challenge no further duty from you? why then should the Church be troubled to call it? *Soc.* † *Though this future Council also should err, yet it may afford remedy against inconveniences; and one great inconvenience being, breaking the Church's peace; this is remedied by its authority,* if I only yield the obedience of silence thereto. † *Stillingf.* p. 542.

Prot. But, if your obedience oblige not to *silence* concerning Councils past, because of your new evidences; neither will it to a future, if you think it also doth err, and either these evidences remain still unsatisfied: Or, these satisfied, yet some other new ones appear, to call for a new consideration.

Soc. † *Because it may also err, it follows not, it must err; and it is probable, that it shall not err, when the former error is thus discovered, and if the Council proceed lawfully, be not over-awed,* &c †. But however; if I ought upon this review to be restrained to *silence*, yet, I not convinced of the truth of its decree, this silence is the uttermost, that any future Council, after its rejecting my reasons, can justly exact of me; and not *belief*, or *assent*, at all, it may not oblige me, that I should relinquish that you call Socinianism at all, but that, not divulge it; whereas now by the Acts of *former* Councils (I would gladly know upon what rational ground) an *Anathema* is pronounced against me if I do not believe the contrary; and I am declared to stand guilty of *Heresie* meerly for retaining this opinion; which retaining it, is called *obstinacy*, and *contumacy* in me, after the Councils contrary *Definition*. † *Stillingf.* ib. † *Idem* p. 526

CONFERENCE. IV.

4. *His Plea for not being guilty of Heresie.*

4. *Prot.* You know, that all *Heretick*s are most justly *anathematized*, and cut off from being any longer members of the Catholick Church, and so do remain excluded also from salvation. Now this *Tenent* of yours hath alwayes been esteemed by the Church of God a most pernicious *Heresie*. *Soc.* I confess *Heresie* a most grievous crime, dread, and abhor it; and trust, I am most free from such a guilt; and from this I have many wayes, of clearing my self. §. 23.

For,

may) to consider their *just* reasons so diligently as they ought, and to call a Council for the correcting of such error according to the weight of these reasons, then here is place for inferiors to proceed to a reformation of such error without them. *Soc.* And who then shall judge, whether the reasons pretended are *defective*, or rather the present Church *negligent* in considering them? *Prot.* Here, I confess, to make *the Superiors* Judges of this, is to cast the Plaintiff before that any Council shall hear his grievance, these Superiors, whose faith appears to adhere to the former Council, being only Judges in their own cause; and so the liberty of complaining will come to nothing †. *Soc.* The inferiors then, that complain, I suppose, are to judge of this. To proceed then. To these Superiors in many diligent writings we have proposed, as we think, many unanswerable Scriptures, and reasons much advanced beyond those represented by our party to the former *Nicen* Council (and therefore from which evidences of ours we have just cause to hope from a future Council a contrary sentence); and finding no redress by their calling another Council for a reviewing this point, we cannot but conceive it as lawful for a Socinian Church; Pastor, or Bishop, for to reform for themselves, and the souls committed to them in an error appearing to them *manifest*, and *intolerable*: as for the Protestants, or for Dr. *Luther*, to have done the same for Transubstantiation, Sacrifice of the Mass, and other points that have been concluded, against the truth, by several former Councils. *Prot.* But such were not *lawful General Councils*, as that of *Nice* was. *Soc.* Whatever these Councils were, this much matters not, as to a *reformation* from them: for had they been lawfully General, yet Protestants hold †, these not universally accepted may err even in *Fundamentals*; or when so accepted, yet may err, in non-fundamentals, errors *manifest*, and *intolerable*, and so may be appealed from to future; and, those not called, their error presently rectified by such parts of Christianity, as discern it; and also S. *Austine* † is frequently quoted by them, saying—*That past General Councils erring, may be corrected by other Councils following.*

† *Still.* p 479. 292.

† See before *Disc.* 3. §. 34. *&c.*

† *De Baptismo* 2 l. 3 c. 3.

§. 22.

Prot. But I pray you consider, if that famous Council of *Nice*, hath so erred, another Council called may it also not err, notwithstanding your evidences proposed to it? For, though perhaps some new Demonstrative proofs you may pretend from several Texts more accurately compared, and explained; yet you will not deny this sufficient evidence to have been extant for that most learned Council to have seen the truth, having then the same entire rule of faith as you now the Scriptures, (in which, you say, your clearest evidences lye), for their direction. When a future Council

(then)

(then) is assembled, and hath heard your plea, will you *assent* to it, and acquiesce in the judgment thereof? *Soc.* Yes; interposing the Protestant-conditions of assent, *if its decree be according to God's Word, and we convinced thereof.* *Prot.* Why; such a submission of judgement, and assent I suppose you will presently yield to me in any thing, whereof you are convinced by me; may this future Council, then, challenge no further duty from you? why then should the Church be troubled to call it? *Soc.* † *Though this future Council also should err, yet it may afford remedy against inconveniences; and one great inconvenience being, breaking the Church's peace; this is remedied by its authority,* if I only yield the obedience of silence thereto. † *Stillingf. p. 542.* *Prot.* But, if your obedience oblige not to *silence* concerning Councils past, because of your new evidences; neither will it to a future, if you think it also doth err, and either these evidences remain still unsatisfied: Or, these satisfied, yet some other new ones appear, to call for a new consideration.

Soc. † *Because it may also err, it follows not, it must err; and it is probable, that it shall not err, when the former error is thus discovered, and if the Council proceed lawfully, be not over-awed,* &c †. But however; if I ought upon this review to be restrained to *silence*, yet, I not convinced of the truth of its decree, this silence is the uttermost, that any future Council, after its rejecting my reasons, can justly exact of me; and not *belief*, or *assent*, at all, it may not oblige me, that I should relinquish that you call Socinianism at all, but that, not divulge it; whereas now by the Acts of *former* Councils (I would gladly know upon what rational ground) an *Anathema* is pronounced against me if I do not believe the contrary; and I am declared to stand guilty of *Heresie* meerly for retaining this opinion; which retaining it, is called *obstinacy*, and *contumacy* in me, after the Councils contrary *Definition*. † *Stillingf. ib.* † *Idem p. 526*

CONFERENCE. IV.

4. *His Plea for not being guilty of Heresie.*

4. PROT. You know, that all *Heretick*s are most justly *anathematized*, and cut off from being any longer members of the Catholick Church, and so do remain excluded also from salvation. Now this *Tenent* of yours hath alwayes been esteemed by the Church of God a most pernicious *Heresie*. *Soc.* I confess *Heresie* a most grievous crime, dread, and abhor it; and trust, I am most free from such a guilt; and from this I have many wayes, of clearing my self. §. 23.

For,

† p. 271. For, Hereſie (as Mr. *Chillingworth* defines it) † being not an erring, but an *obſtinate* defence of an error; not of any error, but of one againſt a *neceſſary*, or *fundamental* Article of the Chriſtian faith, 1ſt. Though this, which I hold ſhould be an error, and that againſt a Fundamental, yet my ſilence practiced therein, can never be called an obſtinate defence thereof, and therefore not my tenent an *Hereſie*. 2ly. Since Fundamentals vary according to particular perſons, and (as Mr. *Chillingworth* ſaith †) — *No Catalogue thereof, that can be given, can univerſally ſerve for all men; God requiring more of them, to whom he gives more, and leſs of them, to whom he gives leſs — And that may be ſufficiently declared to one (all things conſidered) which (all things conſidered) is not to another ſufficiently declared: and variety of circumſtances makes it as impoßible to ſet down an exact Catalogue of Fundamentals, as to make a Coat to fit the Moon in all her changes*: And (as Mr. *Stillingfleet* follows him †) *ſince the meaſure of Fundamentals depends on the ſufficiency of the propoſition; and none can aſſigne, what number of things are ſufficiently propounded to the belief of all perſons, or ſet down the exact bounds, as to all individuals, when their ignorance is inexcuſable, and when not; or tell, what is the meaſure of their capacity: what allowance God makes for the prejudices of Education*, &c. Hence I conceive my ſelf free from Hereſie, in this my opinion, on this ſcore alſo; becauſe, though the contrary be to ſome others a Fundamental truth, and to be explicitly believed by them; yet to me, as not having any ſufficient propoſal, or conviction thereof, but rather of the contrary, it is no *Fundamental*, and conſequently, my tenent oppoſing it, if an *error*, yet no *Hereſie*.

p. 134.

† p. 98, 99

§. 24. *Prot.* Do not deceive your ſelf; for though, according to different revelations, to thoſe that were without Law; or thoſe under the Law; or thoſe under the Goſpel; *Fundamentals*, generally ſpoken of, might be more to ſome, than others; yet to all thoſe, who know, and embrace the Goſpel, we ſay †; all Fundamentals are therein clearly propoſed to all reaſonable men, even the unlearned; and therefore the erring therein, to all ſuch, cannot but be obſtinate, and Heretical. *Soc.* Unleſs you mean onely this: That all Fundamentals, (*i. e.* ſo many as are required of any one) are clear to him in Scripture: but not all the ſame Fundamentals, there, clear to every one: but to ſome more of them, to ſome fewer; I ſee not how this, laſt ſaid, accords with that ſaid before by the ſame perſon. But if you mean thus: then *conſubſtantiality*, (the point we talk of) may be a Fundamental to you, and clear in Scripture: but alſo not clear to me in Scripture, and ſo no Fundamental; and hence, I think my ſelf ſafe. For, — † *I believing all, that is clear to me in Scripture, muſt needs*

† *Chillingw.* p. 92.

needs believe all fundamentals, I cannot incur Heresie, which is opposit to some fundamental — †*The Scripture sufficiently informing me what is the Faith, must of necessity also teach me, what is Heresie: That which is streight will plainly teach us, what is crooked; and one contrary cannot but manifest the other.*

† Chilling. p. 367.
* Id. p. 101

§. 25.

Prot. I pray you consider a little better, what you said last; for since Heresie, as you grant it, is an obstinate defence of error only against some *necessary* point of Faith; and all truth delivered in Scripture is not such; unless you can also distinguish, in Scripture, these points of necessary Faith from others, you can have no certain knowledge of Heresie: and the believing all that is delivered in Scripture, though it may preserve you from *incurring* Heresie, yet cannot direct you at all for *knowing*, or *discerning* Heresie, or an error against a fundamentall, or a necessary, point of Faith, from other simple and less dangerous errors, that are not so: nor by this can you ever know, what errors are Heresies, what not; and so, after all your confidence, if by your neglect, you happen not to believe some Scriptures in their true sence, you can have no security in your Fundamentall, or necessary, Faith; or of your not incurring *Heresie*. Neither, Secondly, according to your discourse, hath the Church any means to know any one to be an *Heretick*; because she can never know the just latitude of his fundamentals. And so *Heresie* will be a grievous sin indeed; but walking under such a vizard of non-sufficient proposal, as the Ecclesiastical Superiors cannot discover or punish it. Therefore to avoid such confusion in the Christian Faith, there hath been alwaies acknowledged in the Church some authority for declaring Heresie: and it may seem conviction enough to you, that her *most general Councils* have defined the contrary position to what you maintain; and received it for a *fundamentall*. Of which Ecclesiastical Authority for declaring Heresie, thus Dr. *Potter*, † — *The Catholick Church is careful to ground all her declarations in matters of Faith, upon the divine authority of Gods written word. And therefore whosoever wilfully opposeth a judgement so well grounded, is justly esteemed an Heretick; not properly; because he disobeyes the Church; but because he yeilds not to Scripture sufficiently propounded, or cleared unto him* [i. e. by the Church.] Where the Dr. seems to grant these two things: That all that the Catholick Church declares against Heresie, is grounded upon the Scripture; and that all such as oppose her judgement are Hereticks: but only he adds, that they are not Hereticks properly, or formally for this opposing the Church, but for opposing the Scriptures. Whilst therefore the *formalis ratio* of Heresie is disputed, that all such are Hereticks, seems granted. And the same

† p. 97

‖ p. 132. Dr. elſe where concludes thus, ‖ — *The miſtaker will never prove, that we oppoſe any Declaration of the Catholick Church,* [he means ſuch a Church as makes Declarations, and that muſt be in her Councils] — *and therefore he doth unjuſtly charge us with Hereſie.* And again,

† p. 103. he ſaith, † — *Whatſoever opinion theſe ancient writers* [*St.* Auſtin, Epiphanius, and others] *conceived to be contrary to the common or approved opinion of Chriſtians, that they called an Hereſie, becauſe it differed from the received opinion not becauſe it oppoſed any formal Definition of the Church:* where in ſaying, *not becauſe it oppoſed any Definition,* he means ; *not only becauſe.* For, whilſt that, which differed from the received opinion of the Church, was accounted an Hereſie by them, that, which differed from a formal definition of the Church, was ſo much more. Something I find alſo, for your better information, in the learned Dr. *Hammond,* † commenting on that notable Text in

† *Titus* 3. 11. *Titus,* — *A man that is an Heretick after the firſt and ſecond admonition, reject,* [a Text implying, contrary to your diſcourſe, Hereſie diſcoverable, and cenſurable by the Church,] where he explains αὐτοκατάκριτος, *ſelf condemned, not to ſignifie a mans publick accuſing, or condemning his own doctrines, or practices ; for that condemnation would rather be a motive to free one from the Churche's cenſures. Nor 2ly to denote one that offends againſt conſcience, and though he knows he be in the wrong, yet holds out in oppoſition to the Church ; for ſo, none but Hypocrites would be Hereticks ; and he that ſtood out againſt the Doctrin of Chriſt, and his Church in the pureſt times* [you may gueſſe whom he means] *ſhould not be an Heretick : and ſo no Heretick could poſsibly be admoniſhed, or cenſured by the Church, for no man would acknowledge of himſelf, that what he did was by him done againſt his own conſcience,* [the plea which you alſo here make for your ſelf.] *But to be an expreſſion of his ſeparation from, and diſobedience to the Church ; and ſo, an evidence of the* ἐξέπτωκε καὶ ἁμαρτάνει, *his being perverted, and ſinning wilfully, and without excuſe.* † What ſay you to this ?

† *See more Proteſtants cited to this purpoſe. Diſc.3.§.19. § 26.*

† *See Dr. Potter p. 165. 167. — Dr. Hammond of Hereſie. §.7 n.3 — §.9.n.8 Def. of L. Faukl. c. 1. p. 23. — See before Diſc. 3.§. 41 n. 1.*

Soc. What theſe Authors ſay, as you give their ſence, ſeems to me contrary to the *Proteſtant* Principles † and their own poſitions elſwhere ; neither, ſurely, will *Proteſtants* tye themſelves to this meaſure, and trial, of *autocatacriſy.* For ſince they ſay ; That lawfull General Councils may erre in Fundamentals ; theſe Councils may alſo define, or declare ſomething *Hereſie,* that is not againſt a Fundamental ; and if ſo, I, though in this ſelf-convinced, that ſuch is their Definition, yet am moſt free from Hereſie, in my not aſſenting to it, or (if they err intollerably) in oppoſing it. Again, ſince Proteſtants ſay, Councels may erre in diſtinguiſhing Fundamentals, theſe Councels may erre alſo in diſcerning Hereſie, which

which is an error against a Fundamental, from other errors that are against non-Fundamentals. Again: Whilst I cannot distinguish Fundamentals in their Definitions, thus no Definition of a General Councel may be receded from by me, for fear of my incurring Heresie: a consequence, which Protestants allow not. Again: Since Protestants affirm all Fundamentals plain in Scripture, why should they place *autocatacrisy*, or self-conviction, in respect of the Declaration of the Church rather, than of the Scripture? But to requite your former quotations, I will shew in plainer language the stating of Protestant Divines concerning autocatacrisy as to the Definitions of the Church, under which my opinion also findes sufficient shelter; *We have no assurance at all* (saith Bishop *Bramhall* †) *that all General Councils were, and always shall be so prudently managed, and their proceedings always so orderly, and upright, that we dare make all their sentences a sufficient conviction of all Christians, which they are bound to believe under pain of damnation.* [I add, or under pain of Heresie] — And *Ib.* p. 102. — *I acknowledge* (saith he) *that a General Council may make that revealed truth necessary to be believed by a Christian as a point of Faith, which formerly was not necessary to be believed; that is, whensoever the reasons and grounds of truth produced by the Council, or the authority of the Council* (*which is, and always ought to be very great with all sober discreet Christians*) *do convince a man in his conscience of the truth of the Councils Definitions*: [which truth I am as yet not convinced of, neither from the reasons, nor authority, of the Council of *Nice*.] Or, if you had rather have it out of Dr. *Potter* — *It is not the resisting* (saith he †) *the voice, or definitive sentence, which makes an Heretick; but an obstinate standing out against evident Scripture sufficiently cleared, unto him. And the Scripture may then be said to be sufficiently cleared, when it is so opened, that a good, and teachable mind* (*loving, and seeking truth*) [my conscience convinceth me not, but that such I am] *cannot gainsay it.* — Again † — *It is possible* (saith he) *that the sentence of a Council or Church may be erroneous, either because the opinion condemned is no Heresie, or error against the Faith, in it self considered; or because the party so condemned is not sufficiently convinced in his understanding* (*not clouded with prejudice, ambition, vain-glory, or the like passion*) *that it is an error* [one of these I account my selfe] Or out of Dr. *Hammond*, † — *It must be lawful for the Church of God* [any Church or any Christian, upon the Drs. reason,] *as well as for the Bishop of* Rome, *to inquire whether the Decrees of an universal Councel have been agreeable to Apostolical Tradition, or no; and if they be found otherwise, to reject them out, or not to receive them into their* beliefe. *And then still it is the matter of the Decrees, and the Apostolicalness*

† *Reply to Chalced.* p. 105.

† p. 128.

† p. 129.

† *Heresie.* p. 114.

licalneſs of them, and the force of the teſtification, whereby they are approved, and acknowledged to be ſuch, which gives the authority to the Council; and nothing elſe is ſufficient, where that is not to be found. And, elſewhere, he both denies in General an Infallibility of Councils, † and grounds the Reverence due to the Four firſt Councils *on their ſetting down and convincing the truth of their Doctrine out of the Scripture words underſtood with piety, and the fetching their Definitions regularly from the ſenſe thereof, which the General Churches had received down from the Apoſtles.* † [Upon which follows, that, in ſuch caſe, where a Lawful General Council doth not ſo, (as poſſibly it may, and Inferiors are to conſider for themſelves whether, it doth not) there may be no Heretical autocatacriſie in a diſſent from it, nor this diſſent *an evidence of the* ἐξεσλεφθαι *and* ἁμαρτάνει, *his being perverted and ſinning wilfully, and without excuſe.*] —Laſtly, thus Mr. *Stillingfleet*, concerning *Hereſie* † —*The formal reaſon of Hereſie is denying ſomething ſuppoſed to be of divine Revelation; and therefore, 2ly None can reaſonably be accuſed of Hereſie, but ſuch as have ſufficient reaſon to believe, that that which they deny is revealed by God. And therefore, 3ly, None can be guilty of Hereſie for denying any thing declared by the Church; unleſs they have ſufficient reaſon to believe, that whatever is declared by the Church is revealed by God; and therefore the Churches Definition cannot make any* Hereticks, *but ſuch as have reaſon to believe, that ſhe cannot err in her Definitions.* From hence alſo he gathers, *That Proteſtants are in leſs danger of Hereſie than Papiſts, till theſe give them more ſufficient reaſons to prove, that whatever the Church declares, is certainly revealed by God.* Thus he. Now ſuch ſufficient proving reaſons, as Proteſtants plead, that Papiſts have not yet given them concerning this matter of Church-authority, I alledge, that neither have they, nor others, given me. To be *ſelf-condemned*, therefore, in my diſſent from the definition of the Council of *Nice*, I muſt firſt have ſufficient reaſon propoſed to me to believe, (and ſo to remain ſelf-condemned, and Heretical in diſbelieving it) this point; *viz.* That the Church, or her Council, hath power to define matters of Faith in ſuch manner, as to require my aſſent thereto. Which ſo long as I find no ſufficient reaſon to believe, I ſuppoſe I am freed (without obſtinacy, or Hereſie, or being therein ſelf-condemned,) from yeilding aſſent to any particular matter of Faith, which the Church defines. And had I ſufficient reaſon propoſed to me for believing this point, yet ſo long as I am not actually convinced thereof, I become only guilty of a fault of *ignorance*, not *obſtinacy*, or *autocatacriſie*, or *Hereſie*; for if I am ſelf-condemned, or guilty of obſtinacy in disbelieving the foreſaid points † *Then I become ſo, either by the Churches definition of this point,*

† *Se before, Diſc. 1 §. 6.*

† *Of Hereſie p. 96.*

† *p. 73.*

† *See Mr. Stillingf. p. 99.*

or

or without it. By reaſon of the Churches definition of this it cannot be; for this very power of defining is the thing in queſtion, and therefore cannot be cleared to me by the Churche's defining it †: and thus, *That thing is propoſed to me in the definition to be believed, which muſt be ſuppoſed to be believed by me already, before ſuch propoſal or definition; or elſe the definition is not neceſſary to be believed.* † Nor *without*, or *before* ſuch definition, can I have an *autocatacriſie*; becauſe this autocatacriſy, you ſay with Dr. *Hammond*, ariſeth from my diſobedience to the Church. *Prot.* Methinks, you make the ſame plea for your ſelfe in this matter, as if one, that is queſtioned for not obeying the *divine precepts*, or not believing the divine revelations delivered in *Scripture*, ſhould think to excuſe himſelf by this anſwer; that indeed he doth not believe the *Scripture* to be *Gods Word*; and therefore he conceives, that he cannot reaſonably be required to believe that, which is contained therein. And, as ſuch a perſon hath as much reaſon (though this, not from the Scripture, yet from Apoſtolical Tradition) to believe, that Scripture is Gods Word, as to believe what is written in it; ſo have you, though not from the *Nicen* Council defining it, yet from Scripture, and Tradition manifeſting it, as much reaſon to believe its authority of defining, as what it defined. Its true indeed; that had you not ſufficient propoſal, or ſufficient reaſon to know this your duty of *Aſſent* to this definition of the Council of *Nice*, you were faultleſs in it; but herein lies your danger, that from finding a *non actual conviction* of the truth, within, (hindred there by I know not what ſupine negligence, or ſtrong ſelf-conceit *&c.*) you gather a *non ſufficient propoſal*, without.

† *Still.* p. 74

† Ib. *p.* 99.

Soc. It remains then to inquire, who ſhall judge concerning this *ſufficient propoſal*, or ſufficient reaſon, which I am ſaid to have, to believe what the *Nicen* Council, or the Church hath declared in this point. † Whether the Churches judgment is to be taken by me in this, or my own made uſe of; If *her judgement*, the ground of my belief, and of Hereſie, lies ſtill in the Churches *definition*; and thus it will be all one in effect, whether I believe what ſhe declares, without ſufficient reaſon; or learn this of her, when there is ſufficient reaſon to believe ſo. It muſt be then, *my own judgment*, I am to be directed by in this matter †: and if ſo, then it is to be preſumed, that God doth both afford me ſome means not to be miſtaken therein; and alſo ſome certain knowledg, when I do uſe this means aright: (for without theſe two I can have no ſecurity in my own judgment in a matter of ſo high concernment, as *Hereſie* and *fundamental faith* is.) Now this means, in this matter, I preſume I have daily uſed, in that I finde my conſcience, after much examination, therein to acquit me, unleſs you can preſcribe me ſome other ſurer evi-

§ 37.

† *Stillingf.* p. 73.

† See *Stilling.* P. 479.

dence, without sending me back again to the *authority* of the *Church*. *Prot.* Whilst your discovery of your tenent to be an *Heresie* depends on your having sufficient reason to believe it is so: And, 2ly, The judgment of your having, or not having sufficient reason to believe this, is left to your self, the Church hath no means to know you, or any other to be an Heretick, till they declare themselves to be so. And thus, in striving to free your selfe from Heresie, you have freed all mankind from it, (as to any external discovery and convincement thereof) and cancelled such a sin; unless we can finde one, that will confess himself to maintain a thing against his own conscience. *Soc.* If I, so do the Protestants; for they also hold none guilty of *Heresie*, for denying any thing declared by the Church, unless they have reason to believe, that what ever is declared by the Church is revealed by God; and of this sufficient reason they make not the *Church*, or *Superiors*, but *themselves*, the Judge.

The V. Conference.

His Plea for not being guilty of Schism.

§. 28.

5. *Prot.* I have yet one thing more, about which to question you. If you will not acknowledge your opinion *Heresie* in opposing the publike judgment, and definition of the Catholick Church in that most reverend Council of *Nice*, upon pretence that you have not had a convincing Proposal, that this Definition was therein made according to *Gods Word*, or the *Scriptures*; yet, how will you clear your self, or your *Socinian* Congregations, of *Schism*? avoidable upon no plea of adherence to *Scripture*, if it shall appear, that you have, for this opinion, deserted the Communion of the *Catholick Church*; out of which Church is no Salvation. *Soc.* † *I grant, there neither is, nor can be any just cause to depart from the Church of* Christ; *no more than from* Christ *himself: therefore I utterly deny, that our Churches have made any separation from the* Church Catholick *at all: and this for many reasons. For* 1^R † — *We have not forsaken the whole Church, or the external Communion of it: but only that* part *of it, which is corrupted, and still will be so, and have not forsaken, but onely reformed another* part *of it, which part* we our selves *are: and I suppose you will not go about to perswade us, that we have forsaken* our selves, *or our own Communion. And if you urge, that we joined our selves to no other part, therefore we separated from the whole: I say, it follows not, in as much as* our selves *were a part*

† Dr. Potter. p. 75.

† Chillingw. p. 274.

of

of it, and still continued so, and therefore can no more separate from the whole, than from our selves.

Prot. So then, it seemes, wee need fear no *Schism* from the *Church Catholick* tilla part can divide from it self, which can never be.

Soc. Next: As for our separating from all other particular Churches, the ground of our Separation being an error, which hath crept into the Communion of these Churches, and which is unjustly imposed upon us in order to this Communion, we conceive, in this case, if any, *They*, not *We*, are the *Schismaticks*: for as the Arch.Bp.† - *The Schism is theirs, whose the cause of it is; and he makes the separation, who gives the first just cause of it, not he that makes an actual separation, upon a just cause preceding.* §. 29. † *Lawd.* p. 142.

Again —Though we have made an actual Separation from them, as to the not-conforming to, or also as to the reforming of, an error: yet, 1ª. *As to Charity*: wedo still retain with the same Churches our former Communion. — † *Not dividing from them through the breach of Charity; Or condemning all other Churches as no parts of the Catholick Church, and drawing the Communion wholy to our selves, as did those famous Schismaticks, the Donatists.* §. 30. † Dr. Ferne *Division of Churches.* p. 105. and 31 32.

Next: *as to matter of Faith*: We hold, that all separation from all particular Churches in such a thing, wherein the *unity* of the Catholick Church doth not consist, is no separation from the whole Church, nor any more than our suspension from the Communion of particular Churches, till such their error is reformed. For as Mr. *Stillingf.* † —*There can be no separation from the whole Church but in such things, wherein the unity of the whole Church lies —Whose therefore separates from any particular Church as to things not concerning their being is onely separated from the Communion of that Church, and not the Catholick.* Now: that for which we have separated from other Churches, we conceive not such, as is essential, or concernes the being of a Church so, that without it we, or they, cannot still retain the essence thereof; we declare also our readiness to joyn with them again, if this error be corrected, or at least not imposed: And † (as Mr. *Stillingf.* faith) —*Where there is this readiness of Communion, there is no absolute separation from the Church as such, but onely suspending Communion, till such abuses be reformed*, [or not pressed upon us], And, as Bp. Bramhall † —*When one part of the universal Church separateth it self from another part, not absolutely, or in essentials, but respectively in abuses, and innovations, not as it is a part of the universal Church, but onely so far as it is corrupted, and degenerated* [whether in doctrine, or manners], *it doth still retain a Communion not onely with the Catholick Church, and with all the Orthodox members of the Catholick Church, but even with that corrupted Church,* §. 31. † p. 331. † *Stilling.* Ib. † *Vindic. of the Church of* England p. 9.

from

from which it is separated, except onely in such Corruptions.

§. 32. *Prot.* Saving better Judgments, methinks a separation (if causeless) from the Communion of all other Churches, or from those who are our Superiours, in a lesser matter than such a Fundamental, or essential point of Christianity, as destroyes the being of a Church, should be *Schism*; and the smaller the point for which we separate, the greater the guilt of our separation. Were not the Donatists Schismaticks in rejecting the Catholick Communion, requiring their conformity in such a point, in which St. *Cyprian*'s error before the Churches defining thereof was very excusable; and the African Congregations in his time not un-churched thereby? Soc. † *But the Donatists did cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which they separated, which is the property of Schismaticks.* — *And* † *They were justly charged with Schism, because they confined the Catholick Church within their own bounds.* But as Dr. *Ferne* saith † — *Had the Donatists only used their liberty, and judgment in that practise of rebaptizing Hereticks, leaving other Churches to their liberty; and (though thinking them in an error for admitting Hereticks, without baptising them, yet) willing to have Communion with them, as parts of the Catholick Church (saving the practices wherein they differed), then had they not been guilty of Schism.* In that which I hold I only follow my conscience, condemn not the Churches holding otherwise: On the other side † *Christ hath forbid me under pain of damnation to profess what I believe not* [be it small or great] *and consequently under the same penalty hath obliged me to leave that Communion, in which I cannot remain without the Hypocritical Profession of such a thing, which I am convinced to be eroneous.* † *At least this I know that the Doctrine which I have chosen, to me* seemes *true; and the contrary, which I have forsaken,* seemes *false: and therefore, without remorse of conscience, I may profess that, but this* I *cannot: and a separation, for preserving my conscience, I hope will never be judged causeless.*

† Dr. *Potter.* p. 76.

† *Stillingf.* p. 359.

Division of Churches. p. 166.

† *Chillingw.* p. 278.

† *Ib.* 279.

§ 33. *Prot.* At this rate none will be a Schismatick, but he who knowes he erreth (*i. e.* not who holdeth, but only who professeth an error); or who knows, that the point, for the non-conformity to which required of him he deserts the Church, is a *Truth*, and the contrary, which he maintaines, an error. But Dr. *Hammond* † tells you. *That he that doth communinate with those* [I suppose he means superiors] *the condition of whose Communion containes nothing really erroneous, or sinful, though the doctrine, so proposed as the condition of their Communion, be apprehended by him, to whom it is thus proposed, to be false,, remaines in Schism.* *Soc.* And, at this rate, all those, who separate from the Church, requiring their assent

† *Of Schism.* p. 23. 24. 25.

assent to what is indeed a truth; will be Schismaticks, (and that, whether in a point fundamental, or not Fundamental,) though they have used all the industry, all the means, they can (except this, the relying on their Superiors judgment) not to err; unless you will say, that all truths, even not Fundamental, are in Scripture so clear, that none using a right industry, can (neither) err in them; which no *Chillingworth* hath maintained hitherto.

§. 34. *Prot.* But we may let this pass, for your separation was in a point perspicuous enough in Scripture (and so you void of such excuse): was in a point Essential, and Fundamental, and in which a wrong belief destroyes any longer Communion of a particular, Person, or Church, with the Catholick. *Soc.* This I utterly deny; nor see I by what way this can ever be proved against me, for you can assigne no Eccleſiastical Judge that can distinguish Fundamentals, Necessaries, or Essentials, from those points that are not so; as hath been shewed already. And as Mr. *Stillingfleet* † urgeth concerning Heresie, so may I concerning Schism: —What are the measures whereby we ought to judge, what things are essential to the being of Christianity, or of the Church? Whether must the *Churches judgment* be taken, or every *mans own judgment*: if *the former*, the Ground of Schism lies still in the Churches definition, contrary to what Protestants affirm: if *the latter*: then no one can be a Schismatick, but he, that opposeth that, of which *he is*, or *may be convinced*, that it is a Fundamental, or essential matter of Faith. If he be only a Schismatick, that opposeth that, of which *he is convinced*; then no man is a Schismatick, but he that goes against his present judgment; and so there will be few Schismaticks in the world; If he, that opposeth that, which *he may be convinced* of; then again, it is that, which *he may be convinced* of, either in the Churches judgment, or in his own: if *in the Churches*; it comes to the same issue, as in the former: If *in his own*, how, I pray, shall I know, that I may be convinced of what, using a due indeavour, I am not convinced already? or, how shall I know, when a due industry is used? and, if I cannot know this, how should I ever settle my self unless it be upon *Authority*, which you allow not. Again, I am taught, that any particular, whether person, or Church, may judge for themselves with the *Judgment* of *Discretion*: And, in the matter of Christian Communion. —† *That nothing can be more unreasonable, than that the Society* [Suppose it be a Council] *imposing conditions of its Communion* [Suppose the Council of Nice imposing Consubstantiality so] *should be Judge, whether those conditions be just, and equitable, or no: And especially in this case, where a considerable Body of-*

† p. 73.

† *Stillingf.* p. 292.

Christians judg such things, required, to be unlawful conditions of communion, what justice, or reason is there, that the party accused should sit judg in his own cause? Prot. By this way no *Separatist* can ever be a *Schismatick* if he is constituted the judge, whether the reason of his separation is just. *Soc.* And in the other way, there can never be any just cause of separation at all, if the Church-Governors, from whom I separate, are to judge, whether that be an error, for which I separate.

§ 35. *Prot.* It seems something that you say; But yet though, upon such consideration, a free use of your own *judgment*, as to providing for your own Salvation, is granted you; yet, methinks, in this matter you have some greater cause to suspect it, since several Churches, having of late taken liberty to examine by Gods Word more strictly the corrupt doctrins of former ages, yet these *reformed*, as well as the other *unreformed*, stand opposit to you; and neither those professing to follow the Scriptures, nor those professing to follow Tradition, and Church authority; neither those requiring strict obedience and submission of judgment, nor those indulging Christian liberty, countenance your doctrin. But you stand also *reformers* of the *reformation*, and separated from all.

Soc. Soft a little. Though I stand separated indeed from the present unreformed Churches; or also (if you will) from the whole Church that was before *Luther*; yet I both injoy the external Communion, and think I have reason to account my self a true member, of the Churches reformed; and as I never condemned them, or thought Salvation not attainable in them; so neither am I (that I know of) excluded by, or from, them; so long as I retain my opinion in silence, and do not disturbe their peace; and I take my selfe also on these termes to be a member, in particular, of the Church of *England*, wherein I have been educated. For all these Churches (as confessing themselves *fallible* in their decrees) do not require of their Subjects to yeeld any *internal assent* to their doctrines; or to profess any thing against their conscience, and in Hypocrisie; and do forbear to use that tyranny upon any for injoying their Communion, which they so much condemn in that Church, from which, for this very thing, they were forced to part Communion, and to reform. Of this matter, thus, Mr. *Whitby* †

† p. 100. — *Whom did our Convocations ever damn for not internally receiving their decrees? Do they not leave every man to the liberty of his judgment? — They do not require, that we should in all things believe, as they believe; but that we should submit to their determination, and not contradict them; their decisions are not obtruded as infallible Oracles, but only submitted to in order to peace, and unity — So that their work is rather to silence, than to determine disputes, &c.* — and p. 438.

We

We grant a neceſsity, or at leaſt a convenience of a Tribunal to decide controverſies, but how? Not by cauſing any perſon to believe what he did not antecedently to theſe decrees, upon the ſole authority of the Council; but by ſilencing our diſputes, and making us acquieſce in what is propounded without any publick oppoſition to it, keeping our opinions to our ſelves — A liberty of uſing private diſcretion in approving or rejecting any thing as delivered, or not, in Scripture, we think ought to be allowed; for faith cannot be compelled; and by taking away this liberty from men, we ſhould force them to become Hypocrites, and ſo profeſs outwardly what inwardly they disbelieve. — And ſee Mr. Stillingfleets — rational account, *p.* 104. where, ſpeaking of the obligation to the 39. Articles, he ſaith, — *That the Church of* England, *excommunicates ſuch as openly oppoſe her doctrin, ſuppoſing her fallible; the* Roman *Church excommunicates all, who will not believe whatever ſhe defines to be infallibly true. — That the Church of* England *bindeth men to peace to her determinations, reſerving to men the liberty of their judgments on pain of excommunication if they violate that peace. For it is plain on the one ſide, where a Church pretends infallibility, the excommunication is directed againſt the perſons for refuſing to give internal aſſent to what ſhe defines: But where a Church doth not pretend to that, the excommunication reſpects wholly that overt Act, whereby the Churches peace is broken. And if a Church be bound to look to her own peace, no doubt ſhe hath power to excommunicate ſuch as openly violate the bonds of it; which is only an act of caution in a Church to preſerve her ſelfe in unity; but where it is given out, that the Church is infallible, the excommunication muſt be ſo much the more unreaſonable, becauſe it is againſt thoſe internal acts of the minde, over which the Church as ſuch, hath no direct power. —* And *p.* 55. he quotes theſe words † *Schiſm* out of Bp. *Bramhall* † To the ſame ſence,— *We do not ſuffer any man guarded, p.* to reject the 39. *Articles of the Church of* England *at his pleaſure; yet* 192. *neither do we look upon them as eſſentials of ſaving faith, or legacies of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles; but, in a mean, as pious opinions fitted for the preſervation of unity; neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them. By which we ſee what vaſt difference there is, between thoſe things which are required by the Church of* England *in order to peace, and thoſe which are impoſed by the Church of* Rome *&c.* Laſtly, thus Mr. *Chillingworth* † of the juſt au- † p. 200.
thority of Councils and Synods (beyond which the Proteſtant Synods, or Convocations pretend not.) — *The Fathers of the Church (*ſaith he*) in after times* [*i. e.* after the Apoſtles] *might have juſt cauſe to declare their judgment, touching the ſence of ſome general Articles of the Creed: but to oblige others to receive their declarations under pain of damnation, what warrant they had, I know not: He that*

can shew, either that the Church of all ages was to have this authority; or, that it continued in the Church for some ages, and then expired: He, that can shew either of these things let him; for my part I cannot. Yet I willingly confess the judgment of a Council, though not infallible, is yet so far directive, and obliging, that (without apparent reason to the contrary) *it may be sin to reject it, at least not to afford it an outward submission for publick peace sake.* [Thus much, as the Protestant Synods seem contented with, so I allow.] — Again p. 375. He saith —, *Any thing besides Scripture, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable, consequences of it, Well may Protestants hold it, as matter of opinion; but, as matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption.* Thus he, now I suppose that either no Ptotestant Church or Synod will stile the Son's coequall God-head with the Father a plain, irrefragable, indubitable Scripture, or consequence thereof, about which is, and hath been so much contest; or, with as much reason, they may call whatever points they please such, however controverted, and then, what is said here signifies nothing.

§ 36. *Prot.* Be not mistaken, I pray: especially concerning the Church of *England*. For though she, for several points, imposed formerly by the tyranny of the Roman Church, hath granted liberty of opinion; or at least freed her subjects from obligation to believe so in them, as the Church formerly required, yet, as to exclusion of your doctrin, she professeth firmly to believe the 3. Creeds; and, concerning the additions made in the two latter Creeds to the first, Dr. *Hammond* † acknowledgeth: — *That they being thus settled by the universal Church, were, and still are in all reason, without disputing, to be received and imbraced by the Protestant Church, and every meek member thereof, with that reverence, that is due to Apostolick truthes; with that thankfulness, which is our meet tribute to those sacred Champions, for their seasonable, and provident propugning our faith; with such timely and necessary application to practice, that the Holy Ghost, speaking to us now, under the times of the New Testament by the Governors of the Christian Churches, (Christs mediate successors in the Prophetick, Pastoral, Episcopal, Office) as he had formerly spoken by the Prophets of the Old Testament, sent immediately by him, may finde a cheerfull audience, and receive all uniform submission from us.* Thus, Dr. *Hammond* of the Church of *England*'s assent to the 3. Creeds. She assenteth also to the definitions of the 4 first General Councils: And the Act 1. *Eliz.*† declares *Heresie*, that, which hath been adjudged so by them; now in the definitions of these first 4. General Councils your tenent hath received a mortal

† Of Fundamentals p. 90.

† cap. 1.

tal wound. † But lastly, *the* 4*th.* Canon in the English Synod *held* 1640. † particularly stiles *Socinianism a most damnable, and cursed Heresie, and contrary to the Articles of Religion established in the Church of* England : *and orders that any, convicted of it, be excommunicated, and not absolved, but upon his repentance, and abjuration.* Now further than this [*namely, excommunication upon conviction.*] No other Church I suppose hath, or can proceed against your Heresie; It being received as a common axiom in the Canon Law; that *Ecclesia non judicat de occultis*, — And — *cogitationis pœnam nemo patitur.* — And — *Ob peccatum mere internum Ecclesiastica censura ferri non potest.* And in all Churches every one, of what internal perswasion soever, continues externally at least a member thereof, till the Churches censures do exclude him. † *Can.* 4.

Soc. The Church of *England* alloweth, assenteth to, and teacheth, what she judgeth evident in the Scripture; for so she ought; what she believes, or assenteth to, I look not after, but what she enjoynes. Now I yeeld all that obedience in this point, that she requires from me; and so I presume she will acknowledge me a dutiful Son. *Prot.* what obedience, when as you deny one of her chiefest, and most fundamental, doctrins? *Soc.* If I mistake not her principles, she requires of me no internal belief or assent to any of her doctrins, but only, 1st, *silence*, or *non-contradiction* †; or 2dly, a *conditional belief*, *i. e.* whenever I shall be convinced of the truth thereof. Now in both these I most readily obey her. For the 1st, I have strictly observed it, kept my opinion to my self; unless this my discourse with you hath been a breach of it; but then I was at least a dutiful subject of this Church at the beginning of our discourse; and for the 2d, whether *actual conviction*, or *sufficient proposal*, be made the condition of my assent, or submission of judgment, I am conscious to my self of no disobedience, as to either of these; for an *actual conviction* I am sure I have not : and supposing, that I have had a *sufficient proposal*, and do not know it, my obedience, upon the Protestant principles, can possibly advance no further, than it now doth. The *Apostles Creed* I totally imbrace, and would have it the standing bound of a Christian Faith. For other *Creeds* : I suppose, no more belief is necessary to the Articles of the *Nicen Creed*, than is required to those of the *Athanasian*. And, of what kind the necessity is of believing those, Mr. *Stillingfleet* states on this manner † — *That the belief of a thing may be supposed necessary, either as to the matter, because the matter to believed is in it self necessary; or because of the clear conviction of mens understandings, that though the matters be not in themselves necessary; yet being revealed by God, they must be explicitly believed : but then, the necessity of this belief* † *See Disc.* 3 § 84. *n.* 2. & *n.* 4. † *p.* 70. 71.

lief doth extend no further, than the clearneſs of the conviction doth. Again: *that the neceſſity of believing any thing ariſing from the Churches definition* [upon which motive you ſeem to preſs the belief of the Article of *Conſubſtantiality*] *doth depend up on the Conviction, that whatever the Church defines is neceſſary to be believed. And, where that is not received as an antecedent principle, the other cannot be ſuppoſed.* [Now this principle neither I, nor yet Proteſtants, accept] Then he concludes —*That as to the Athanaſian Creed* [and the ſame it is for the Nicen] *It is unreaſonable to imagin, that the Church of* England *doth own this neceſſity, purely on the account of the Churches definition of thoſe things which are not fundamental, it being directly contrary to to her ſence in her* 19th. *and* 20th. *Articles.* [Now, which Articles of this Creed are not Fundamental, ſhe defines nothing nor do the 19, 20. or 21. Articles own a neceſſity of believing the Churches Definitions, even as to *Fundamentals.*] *And hence, that the ſuppoſed neceſſity of the belief of the Articles of the Athanaſian Creed muſt, according to the ſence of the Church of* England, *be reſolved, either into the neceſſity of the matters, or into that neceſſity, which ſuppoſeth clear conviction, that the things therein contained are of divine Revelation.* Thus he. Now, for ſo many Articles as I am either convinced of the matter to be believed, that it is in it ſelf neceſſary; or, that they are divine Revelations, I do moſt readily yield my faith, and aſſent thereto. Now to make ſome

§. 38. Reply to the other things you have objected.

The Act 1° *Eliz.* allows no Definitions of the 1ſt. General Councils in declaring *Hereſie*, but with this limitation, that, in ſuch Councils, ſuch things be declared *Hereſie* by the expreſs, and plain words of the *Canonical Scripture.* On which terms I alſo accept them.

§ 39. Dr. *Hammond* affirming: *That all additions ſettled by the Univerſal Church* [if he means General Councils] *are in all reaſon, without diſputing, to be received as Apoſtolical Truths, that the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking to us by the Governors of the Chriſtian Churches, Chriſt's Succeſſors, may receive all uniform ſubmiſſion from us,* ſuits not with the Proteſtant Principles often formerly mentioned.† For thus (if I rightly underſtand him) all the definitions of General Councils, and, of the Chriſtian Governors in all ages, as theſe being ſtill Chriſts Succeſſors, are to be, without diſputing, embraced as truths Apoſtolical.

† *See before* §. 26.

§ 40. If the words of the fourth *Canon* of the *Engliſh Synod* 1640. ſignifie any more, than this; That any perſon, *convicted* of Socinianiſm (*i.e.* by publiſhing his opinion) ſhall, upon ſuch conviction, be excommunicated; and if it be underſtood adequate to this. *Qui non crediderit filium eſſe ὁμοούσιον Deo Patri, Anathema ſit,*

and

and, that the Church of England, for allowing her Communion, is not content with *silence* in respect of Socinianism, but obligeth men also to *assent* to the contrary; then, I see not upon what goodgrounds such exclamation is made against the like Anathema's or exactions of assent required by that of *Trent*, or other late Councils, or by *Pius* his Bull. If it be said here: the reason of such faulting them is, because these require assent, not being lawful *General Councils*, such reason will not pass; 1st. Because, neither the English Synod, exacting assent in this point, is a General Council. 2ly. Because: it is the Protestant tenent, that neither may lawful General Councils require *assent* to all their Definitions. Or, if it be affirmed (either of *General*, or *Provincial* Councils) that they may require assent under Anathema to some of their decrees: *Viz.* Those evidently true, and divine Revelation; such as *Consubstantiality* is; but may not to others; *Viz.* Those not manifested by them to be such; then, before we can censure any Council for its Anathema's, or its requiring of assent, we must know, whether the point, to which assent is required, is, or is not, evident divine Revelation. And then; by whom, or how shall this thing touching the evidence of the Divine Revelation be judged, or decided? for those that judge this, who ever they be, do sit now upon the trial of the rightness, or mistake, of the judgment of a General Council? Or when, think we, will those who judge this (*i. e.* every person for himself) agree in their sentence? Again: If, on the other side, the *former Church* in her language, *Si quis non crediderit, &c. Anathema sit*, be affirmed (to which purpose the fore-mentioned Axioms are urged by you) to mean nothing more, than, *Si quis Hæresin suam palam profiteatur, & hujus professionis convictis fuerit, Anathema sit*, Thus the Protestants former quarrel with her passing such *Anathema's* will be concluded causeless, and unjust. But indeed though, (according to the former sentences), her Anathema is not extended to the internal act of holding such an opinion, if wholly concealed, so far, as to render such person for it to stand *excommunicated*, and lie actually under this censure of the Church, because hitherto no contempt of her authority appears, nor is any dammage inferred to any other member of her Society thereby: Yet her *Anathema* also extends, even to the internal act, or tenet, after the Churches contrary definition known (which tenet also then is not held without a disobedience, and contempt of her authority) so far, as to render the delinquent therein guilty of a very great *mortal sin*; and so at the same time internally cut off from being a true member of *Christs Body*; though externally he is not as yet so cut off. And the Ca-

suists

suists further state him *ipso facto* to be excommunicated, before, and without conviction, if externally he doth, or speaketh any thng, whereby he is convincible; and not if there be any thing *proved* against him, but if any thing at least *provable*; and such a one, upon this, to be obliged in conscience, not only to confess his heretical opinion, for his being absolved from *mortal sin*; but also to seek a release from excommunication incurred, for his reinjoying the Churches *Communion*. Thus you see a rigor in this Church towards what it once accounted *Heresie* much different from the more mild Spirit, and moderate temper of the *reformed*.

§ 41. To conclude. For the enjoying the *Protestant* Communion, I conceive that, as to any necessary approbation of her Doctrines, it is sufficient for me to hold with Mr. *Chillingworth* (as I do †) — *That the doctrine of Protestants, though not that, of all of them, absolutely true, yet is free from all impiety, and from all Error destructive to salvation, or in it self damnable.* And † — *whatsoever hath been held necessary to Salvation by the consent of Protestants, or even of the Church of* England, [which, indeed, hath given no certain Catalogue at all of such *necessaries*], *that, against the Socinians, and all others whatsoever, I do verily believe, and embrace.* — And (which is still the same) † — *I am perswaded, that the constant doctrine of the Church of* England, *is so pure, and Orthodox, that whosoever believes it, and lives according to it, undoubtedly he shall be saved.* [For if all truths necessary to Salvation be held in it, then, so, is no error, opposite, or destructive to Salvation, held by it, and so, living according to the truths it holds, I may be saved] Again † — *I believe, that there is no error in it, which may necessitate, or warrant any man to disturb the peace, or renounce the Communion of it,* [For, though I believe *Antisocinianism*, an error; Yet if I hold it not such, as that for it any man may disturb the peace, or ought to renounce the Communion, of this Church, I may profess all this, and yet hold Socinianism.] Lastly as he, † so I — *Propose me any thing out of the Bible, seem it never so incomprehensible, I will subscribe it with hand, and heart. In other things* [that I think not contained in this Book], *I will take no mans liberty of judgment from him, neither shall any man take mine from me; for I am fully assured, that God doth not, and therefore that men ought not, to require any more of any man, than this; To believe the Scripture to be Gods Word, to indeavor to find the true sence of it; and to live according to it. Without pertinacy I can be no Heretick; And* † *indeavouring to find the true sence of Scripture, I cannot but, hold my error without pertinacy, and be ready to forsake it, when a more true*

† *Chillingw. Preface* § 39.

† *Ib* § 28.

† *Ib.* § 39.

† *Ib.*

† *Chill.* p. 376

† *Ib.* §. 57.

true, and a more probable sence shall appear unto me.—And then, all necessary truth; being plainly set down in Scripture, I am certain by believing Scripture to believe all necessary truth; and in doing so, my life being answerable to my faith, how is it possible I should fail of Salvation? Thus Mr. *Chillingworth* speaks perfectly my sence. *Prot.* I see no other cure for you: but that you learn *humility* and *mortification* of your *understanding* (in which lies the most subtle, and perilous of all *Prides*): And, It will reduce you to *Obedience*: and this, to *Truth*; That, with all the Church of God, you may give glory to *God the only begotten Son*, and *the Holy Ghost, coessential with God the Father.* To which *Trinity* in *Unity*, as it hath been from the beginning, and is now, so shall all Honour, and Glory be given, throughout all future ages. *Amen.*

FINIS.

Addenda.

† *Brerw. Enquir.* p. 84. & 88.

† *Ib.* p. 67.

Page 30. *line* 31. *After* Turky *Add.* *Brerewood* † computing the whole Body of Christians in *Asia* (including also those united with *Rome*) not to amount to a twentieth part of its inhabitants: and all the *Turks* Dominions in *Europe* not to exceed the magnitude of *Spain*. † Throughout whose Dominions also the chief, *&c.*

Page 30. *line penult.* *After* Field *p.* 63. *Add.* And *Brerewood's* inquire. *c.* 19. *p.* 147.

Page 31 *line* 17 *After* reside, *Add.* (To which in the last place may be added that great *Body* of the same Communion, that hath long flourished, and daily enlargeth it self, throughout the *West-Indies.*)

Page 51 *line* 4. *After* [practice] *Add.* To all these may be further added the early Condemnation, that is found in Antiquity, of those modern tenents of several Protestants in opposition, to *a subordination of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, to the utility of Prayer for the Dead, of Invocation of the Saints, Veneration of Saints Reliques, set Fasting-dayes, Festivals, Vigils, Abstinence from certain meats, Monastick vows, especially that of Virginity and Celibacy, Hermitages, Disparity of the Cœlestial Rewards, and degrees of Glory.* The maintainers of which long ago, *Arrius* ||, *Jovinian* †, *Vigilantius* *, were condemned as Hereticks, (*i. e.* as opposers of those points, that the general Church practice received and allowed as lawful,) by the Fathers of those times, and being crushed by their Censures were prevented from receiving any further sentence from a Council. Lastly, why was there made a departure from the Church, at least for many of these points, *&c.*

|| *Vid.* Epiphan Hær. 75 — *August.* Hær. 53.

† *Vid. Hieron: contra Jovin.* — *Austin. Hær.* 82.

* *Vid. Hieronym. contra Vigilant.*

Page 66 *line* 19. *After Himself, Add.* And so this Person, supposed by Protestants to have been raised up by God to vindicate his Truth, yet was permitted by him to dy, in their conceit, a Desertor of it; *i. e.* reconciled to the doctrin of the Church.



Page 93 *line ult.* *After exordium unitatis, Add.* The Ecclesiasticalunity in which Bishop, *Grotius* conceiveth so necessary, as that he saith,

† *Non posse Protestantes inter se jungi, nisi simul jungantur cum iis, qui sedi* Romanæ *cohærent; sine qua* (saith he) *nullum sperari potest in Ecclesia commune regimen.* — Again — *Inter causas* [divulsionis Ecclesiæ] *non esse primatum Episcopi Romani secundùm Canones, favente* Melanchone, *qui eum primatum etiam necessarium putat ad retinendam unitatem. Neque enim hoc esse, Ecclesiam subjicere Pontificis libidini, sed reponere ordinem sapienter institutum.* Thus moderate Protestants of the Churches unity founded *Supremely*, as to single persons, in the *Bishop* of *Rome*. † Rivet. *Apol. discussio* p. 255.

Page 96 *line* 15. *After*, Cæteris, *Add.* And accordingly, in all those instances, gathered out of Antiquity by Arch-Bishop *Lawd*, † where *inferior Synods* have reformed abuses in manners, or made Decrees in causes of Faith (as it is willingly granted, many have done) it cannot be shewed, that any of them hath done either of these in matters stated, before, contrarily by a *Superior Authority* (a thing with which Protestants are charged.) Somthing was, then, stated or reformed, by Inferiors *without*; nothing *against*, their Superiors. † § 24. n. 5.

Page 103 *line* 36. *After*, times, *Add.* *Baron.* saith, † That — *In tantâ errorum offusâ caligine, qui substantiæ Filii Dei assertores essent, a nostris in pretio habebantur, ut pote quod (ut sæpius est dictum) nullâ aliâ re viderentur a Catholicis differre, nisi quod vocem Consubstantialitatis non admitterent.* † *A. D.* 358.

Page 104 *line* 8, *After*, mentioned, *Add.* So, but that the words are well capable of an Orthodox sence. So that the seventeenth and twenty sixth *Articles* in the first *Sirmian Confession* as they are understood by *Sozomen* in the Semi-Arrian †, so are they (compared with the antecedents) expounded by St. *Hillary* † in a Catholick sence. The Semi-Arrian Bishops, it seems, *&c.* † *l.* 5. *c.* † *De Synodis.*

Page 125 *line ult.* *After errores*, *Add.* And *Ib. q.* 5. *a.* 3. — *Omnibus articulis fidei inhæret fidei propter unum medium, sci: propter veritatem primam propositam a nobis in Scripturis, secundùm doctrinam Ecclesiæ, sane intelligendis.* See several Authorities to this purpose collected by *Fr. a S. Clara in System. Fid. c.* 7.

Page 206 *line* 3. *After*, *Accesserunt*, *Add.* Concerning, [1], the *corruption* of humane nature and bondage under sin; [2] Justification *gratuital*, and [3], *Christs Sacerdotal Office*, thus he censures ancient Church-Tradition † — *Verum, si quid in controversiam vocetur, quia flexibile est το ἐγγεαφον* [the holy Scriptures] *inter nasi cerei si absque Traditionis subsidio, quicquam definire fas non sit, quid jam fiet præ-* † *Resp. ad Cassand. offic. Pii viri in Cassand. oper.* p. 802.

ciputs

cipuis Fidei noſtræ capitibus? Tria ſolum, exempli cauſa proferam, 1. *Naturæ noſtræ corruptio, & miſera animæ ſervitus, ſub peccati Tyrannide,* 2. *Gratuita juſtificatio,* 3. *Et Chriſti Sacerdotium, apud vetuſtiſſimos Scriptores ita obſcurè attingitur, ut nulla inde certitudo poſſit elici. — Si ex eorum Traditione hauriendæ ſit cognitio ſalutis noſtræ, jacebit omnis Fiducia, quia ex illis nunquam diſcemus, quomodo Deo reconciliemur; quomodo illuminemur a Spiritu ſancto, & formemur in obſequium juſtitiæ; quomodo gratis accepta nobis feratur Chriſti obedientia; quid valeat ſacrificium mortis ejus, & continua pro nobis interceſſio; quarum rerum luculenta explicatio in Scripturâ paſſim occurrit. Itaque (novo hoc Magiſtro* [Caſſandro] *Authore,) quæcunque ad ſalutem apprimè cognitu neceſſaria ſunt, non tantùm manebunt ſemi-ſepulta, ſed, quia* nulla Traditio *ſuffragatur* [i. e. in Antiquity] *certitudine carebunt.* Thus he, And it is very true, that of ſuch a Doctrin, as many Proteſtants deliver in theſe matters, no footſteps will be found in antiquity; and that *nulla Traditio ſuffragabitur.*

Page 230 *line* 35. *After,* cenſetur, *Add.* And *Ib. q.* 5. *ar.* 3. — *Si quis non pertinaciter diſcredit articulum Fidei, paratus ſequi in omnibus doctrinam Eccleſiæ, jam non eſt hæreticus, ſed ſolùm errans.*

Page 342 *line* 28. *After,* Prot. *Add.* No perſon, that is appointed by our Lord to be a *Judge* in any Controverſie (as thoſe Biſhops, you have mentioned, were in the cauſe of *Arrius*) can rightly, or properly, be ſaid to be on that ſide, for which he gives ſentence, a *Party*. Nor doth their giving ſentence once againſt any ſide prejudice them (as enemies, or oppoſites, or intereſſed,) from ſitting on the Bench, as oft as need requires, to paſſe it again, alone, or with others. But, if every one may be afterward called an Anti-Party, who once declareth himſelf of a contrary Judgment, I perceive, &c.



FINIS.